NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI®

University of Alberta

Displacement and Literature: The Writings of Volodymyr Vynnychenko, 1907-1925

by

©

Mykola Soroka

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 2005

Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

0-494-08734-X

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN:
Our file *Notre reference*
ISBN:

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

ABSTRACT

This study explores how geographical displacement influenced the writings of Volodymyr Vynnychenko, who lived most of his life and wrote the majority of his works outside his homeland, Ukraine. It embraces a broad approach to displaced experience (travel, émigré, expatriation, exile) viewing it as a complex process of negotiation between different social and cultural spaces. This dissertation demonstrates that Vynnychenko's stay abroad determined his social, cultural, and philosophical outlook, his ideological preoccupations, his attitude toward the homeland and hostland society, as well as his choice of themes and settings.

The work focuses on two periods (1907-14 and 1920-25). Although during the first period Vynnychenko's main focus was his homeland, I analyze how Vynnychenko's sojourn in Europe significantly enhanced his modernist views and helped him develop a new vision through travel, contact with various people, self-education, admiration of art, and the experience of personal freedom. Despite the joys of his initial expatriation, Vynnychenko also experienced the bitterness of exile and nostalgia for the homeland. His absence from Ukraine not only strengthened his national preoccupations, but also marked a tendency to embrace abstract ideas, sharpened his critical perspective of the homeland, and allowed him to pursue provocative modernist themes.

During the years 1920-25 Vynnychenko experienced a particularly extreme sense of uprootedness. I examine the tensions between his desires for Ukrainian statehood and his equal commitment to communist ideals. I also point out his conflicts with the diaspora

and the Bolsheviks; and the requirements to balance politics and literature as careers. At this time he moved from his old provocative moral and family themes to the three-volume utopian *Soniachna mashyna*, a multifaceted novel that aroused radically different responses in the homeland and in the West. As an ideological and philosophical polemic with both the Soviet Union and Western capitalism, this work served to channel Vynnychenko's uncertainty about the present by allowing him to project an idealized future.

In the Conclusion I offer a summary of my thesis and outline Vynnychenko's further development in displacement from 1925 to 1951.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my supervisors, Dr. Ilnytzkyj and Dr. Pylypiuk, for taking me aboard the ship of graduate studies and bringing me successfully to the other shore of new experience and knowledge. I am grateful to Dr. Ilnytzkyj for his great mastery of navigation, for his enormous efforts to shape and stimulate my thoughts, which in the end took the form of the present thesis. I thank Dr. Pylypiuk for not allowing me to lose my way with her deep insight and critical observations.

I also extend my deepest thanks to all those who helped me in various ways to complete the project: Dr. Hjartarson, for directing me through the valleys of theory; Dr. Nebesio, for his assistance with film aspects of the work; Dr. John-Paul Himka, for useful comments concerning the historical background; Dr. Onyshkevych, for sharing with me her knowledge of Vynnychenko's writings; Ksenya Kiebuzinski, for familiarizing me with aspects of Ukrainian-French relations and for sending me literature on the subject; Olena Jennings, for her assistance with the translation of Vynnychenko's works; and Marta D. Olynyk, for her professional and well-timed editing. I am thankful to the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies whose award, the Helen Darcovich Memorial Doctoral Fellowship, enabled me to complete my programme.

I thank my family: my wife Nadiya for her invaluable moral support and titanic patience, and my sons: Rostyslav, for letting me use the computer when he was not playing computer games, and Lubomyr, who came into this world during the course of this work and became a great inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

Chapter One
BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND AND THEORETICAL PREMISES 1
1.1. Arrivals and Departures: A Biographical Overview 1
1.2. The Issue of Displaced Writings in Literary Discourse 11
1.3. Vynnychenko within the Theoretical Framework: General Overview 28

Chapter Two
THE FIRST DISPLACEMENT, 1907-1914 38
2.1. Displacement and the Modernist Experience 38
  2.1.1. Creativity and Travel in Perspective 38
  2.1.2. Europe and Ukrainian Modernism 44
  2.1.3. Ukrainian Writers in Europe 50
2.2. Vynnychenko as a Displaced European Modernist Writer 56
  2.2.1. The Life of Displaced Modernist Artists 79
    A. *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* 81
    B. "Olaf Stefenzon" 95
2.3. The Émigré Writes Back 110
2.4. Encounters with the Hostland 142
  2.4.1. Expatriation without Pain: "Taina" and Other Stories 151
  2.4.2. Bitterness of Exile: *Rivnovaha* 164
  2.4.3. Reconciliation through Nostalgia 194

Chapter Three
THE SECOND DISPLACEMENT, 1920-1925 220
3.1. Hectic Years at Home, 1914-1920 221
3.2. From Czechoslovakia to the Weimar Republic 225
3.3. Ambiguities of the New Displacement 238
3.4. From Old Themes to Visions of Utopia 259
3.5. Displacement and Utopia: The Novel *Soniachna Mashyna* (1921-1924) 270
  3.5.1. Plot—Structure—Style 273
  3.5.2. Utopia as a Manifestation of Uprootedness 287
  3.5.3. The Ideological and Philosophical Aspects of *Soniachna Mashyna* 301
  3.5.4. Between Homeland and Hostland: One Novel—Two Receptions 328

Conclusions 367
Bibliography 389
Appendix. Chronological List of Vynnychenko's Works 413

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CIUS—Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

DP—Displaced persons

DVU—Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy [State Publishing House of Ukraine]

RUP—Revolutsiina Ukrains'ka Partiia [Revolutionary Ukrainian Party]

UNR—Ukrains'ka Narodna Respublika [Ukrainian National Republic]

USDRP—Ukrains'ka Sotsial-Demokratychna Robitnycha Partiia [USDWP—Ukrainian Social-Democratic Workers' Party]

UVAN—Ukrains'ka Vil'na Akademiia Nauk [Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences]

NRF—Nouvelle Revue Française

NOTE ON TRANSLATIONS

All translations from Ukrainian and Russian into English are mine, unless the source of translation is specifically indicated.

PREFACE

This dissertation is devoted to Volodymyr Vynnychenko, a writer who lived most of his life and wrote the majority of his works outside his homeland, but whose works remain largely unstudied from the perspective of geographical displacement. This state of affairs probably results from the fact that he was one of the most famous and influential writers in Ukrainian literature and, thus, was mostly analyzed in mainstream discourse, which quite often ignores tangential discourses. This phenomenon of marginalization is quite apparent in the study of Ukrainian diasporic literature. In Soviet literary criticism the principle of Antaeus was applied: i.e., literature written abroad cannot be true literature because it is detached from the native social and cultural milieu (Soroka). Ievhen Shabliovs'kyi, for example, substantiates his criticism of Vynnychenko in this manner: "Taking Vynnychenko as an example, we are again persuaded that an artist who gives up his progressive principles and betrays his people cannot create anything considerable and significant, and he becomes like a sterile flower" (48). Such an approach was, however, largely motivated by Soviet ideological prejudice toward so-called "Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists." A colonial approach was also at work, for whereas Russian émigré anti-Communist writers (e.g., Ivan Bunin) were published in the USSR (Bazhynov), the works of Vynnychenko, a former member of the Social-Democratic and Communist parties and persistent supporter of communist ideals, were falsely lambasted as "bourgeois nationalist" (Shabliovs'kyi).[1] In contrast, in certain circles in the diaspora, Vynnychenko was considered too left-leaning and modernistic. For instance, diaspora readers refused to support the almanac *Pivnichne siaivo* [Northern Lights] (Edmonton) after it published Vynnychenko's novel, *Poklady zolota* [Deposits of Gold] (5 (1971): 7-118). As a result, the almanac folded.

---

[1] In the 1960s, following the partial democratization of political life and the rehabilitation of some writers in the USSR, there were attempts to publish Vynnychenko's children's story "Viiut' vitry, viiut' buini"

Since Ukraine's independence in 1991 another problem has persisted, which I call "metropolitan centralism"—a tendency to neglect, whether consciously or unconsciously, peripheral phenomena, among which the perspective of displacement is often situated. For example, taking their cue from Oleksandr Bilets'kyi's[2] analysis of Vynnychenko's novel, *Soniachna mashyna* [The Solar Machine] (1921-24, published in 1928), many scholars (e.g., Mykola Zerov, Vasyl' Chaplenko, etc.) began repeating that it was the first utopian novel in Ukrainian literature. In fact, the first Ukrainian utopian novel, *Koly ziishlo sontse* [When the Sun Rose] (1918) was written—also in exile—by Pavlo Krat [Paul Crath] (Smyrniw 1996). Another problem concerns the disregard for works written outside the homeland. Hryhorii Shton', for example, in his contribution to *Istoriia ukrains'koii literatury* [History of Ukrainian Literature], focuses on Ulas Samchuk's early works that were written in Ukraine, but completely ignores his novel about diasporic life, *Na tverdii zemli* [On Firm Ground] (1963-1966).

Similarly, the problems of displacement were neglected in the study of Vynnychenko's works. For instance, scholars often consider his displacement only from 1920, the year when the writer went into his final exile (Fedchenko, Shumylo, Syvachenko 1994; 2003; Revuts'kyi), and ignore the first displacement, 1907-14. During

---

[The Wild Winds Blow] in a journal. However, after the story was printed, the entire edition of the journal was destroyed, and its editor was punished (Hrechaniuk, 192-94).

[2] Originally, his article "'Soniachna mashyna' V.Vynnychenka" [V. Vynnychenko's *Soniachna mashyna*] appeared in the journal *Krytyka* 2 (1928): 31-43. Here I refer to its publication in Bilets'kyi, Oleksandr. 1990. *Literaturno-krytychni statti*, pp. 121-31. Kyiv: Dnipro.

this period Vynnychenko's connections with his homeland were so strong that his presence in Ukraine was taken for granted. For example, Valerian Revuts'kyi in his article "Emihratsiina dramaturhiia V. Vynnychenka" [Émigré Plays of V. Vynnychenko] examines only plays written during the final migration, even though the title implies all émigré plays.

Publishers in the diaspora tended to prefer Vynnychenko's early works and materials that dealt primarily with Ukrainian topics or settings. For instance, the play *Mizh dvokh syl* [Between Two Powers] (1919) was republished in 1974; the collection of children's stories, *Namysto* [Necklace] (1930) was republished in 1976; the novel *Na toi bik* [To the Other Side] (1923) appeared in 1972; and the early diaries (*Shchodennyk*) appeared in 1980 (vol. 1, 1911-1920) and 1983 (vol. 2, 1921-1925). Vynnychenko's last novel *Slovo za toboiu, Staline* [Take the Floor, Stalin] (1950, first published in 1971) touches almost exclusively upon Ukrainian homeland topics. But his novel about Ukrainian émigrés in France, *Poklady zolota*, written in 1927, was published only in 1988. The play *Prorok* [Prophet] (1929), which was first published in the West in 1960, takes the reader to India and the USA, and is thus an exception in that it focuses on a non-Ukrainian locale and characters. It is worth noting, however, that the latter appeared together with other stories.[3]

In Ukraine, once it became permissible to write about the once proscribed Vynnychenko, critics also began to devote attention primarily to his early works set in the homeland (e.g., *Krasa i syla* [Beauty and Strength], 1989; *Vybrani piesy* [Selected Plays],

---

[3] It includes the stories "Bilesen'ka" [The Little White Cat] and "Stelysia, barvinku, nyzen'ko" [Creep, Periwinkle, Low, Low]. The former (written in 1926) is about a homeless cat that becomes a member of Di and Nun's family, bringing a new sense of happiness into their everyday lives; whereas the latter (written in 1922), based on Vynnychenko's recollections of his early youth in Ukraine, is a story about gymnasium students.

1991). At the same time some of his exile works were republished.[4] The novel *Leprozorii* [Leprosarium], which is set in France, was published for the first time only in 1999 (*Vitchyzna*, nos. 1-6). Also set in France, the novel *Vichnyi imperatyv* [Eternal Imperative] is still waiting for a publisher, as well as 26 volumes of the diary, which deal with the period of exile (1926-1951), and the philosophical treatise *Konkordyzm* [Concordism] (1938-48).[5]

Although there are disagreements about various aspects of Vynnychenko's writing, all scholars (Zerov, Panchenko, Hnidan, and Demianivs'ka etc.) almost unanimously identify three periods in his literary career: (1) 1902-1906, the period of short stories, which features objective and impartial observations of life, primarily of the lower social classes (peasants, workers, hoboes, criminals); (2) 1907-1920, the period of drama and the novel, which indicates a shift toward analysis and experimentation, moral and philosophical issues, and a preference for ideas over description; (3) 1921-1951, the period of socio-fantastic and adventure novels, and philosophical treatises, with an emphasis on propagandizing his ideas through a more popular style. I believe that this periodization and change in focus corresponds to the writer's various states of displacement. However, until now few critics have suggested this hypothesis. Semen Pohorilyi, in particular, notes:

---

[4] The novel *Soniachna mashyna* appeared in a book edition in 1989 and a journal edition in *Kyiv*, 1989; *Slovo za toboiu, Staline* in the journal *Vitchyzna*, 1989, nos. 6-7; *Poklady zolota* in the journal *Berezil'*, 1991, nos. 3-5; the play *Prorok* in the journal *Vitchyzna*, 1992, no. 4.

[5] All these unpublished works are situated in the Vynnychenko archive at Columbia University, New York (recently it was temporarily transferred to Princeton University, New Jersey). The Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, based at the University of Alberta, has copies of his unpublished diary, which I used for my study. Some fragments of his diary appeared in the periodical press. Vynnychenko's early writings are stored in various archives in Ukraine, in particular at the Institute of Manuscripts, Vernadsky Central Scientific Library in Kyiv (Fund 293) and in the Central State Archive of Ukraine (Fund 1823).

> This division is thoroughly connected with biographical changes in the life of the writer: the first period mostly with wandering, searching for work, and imprisonment; the second period with large cities, activities among the revolutionary intelligentsia, and sporadic travels abroad; the third period with permanent residence in Western Europe and the dominance of universal themes and problems (11).

But geographical displacement as a specific biographical, social and cultural phenomenon that in many respects impacts Vynnychenko's writings is a largely neglected subject. Pohorilyi's task was simply to present an extensive description of unpublished texts and make them known to the reader; thus, he did not focus on the actual condition of displacement. Zales'ka-Onyshkevych in her article "Prorok—ostannia drama Volodymyra Vynnychenka" [Prorok—the Last Play of Volodymyr Vynnychenko] notes the author's switch to non-Ukrainian themes but does not connect it with his displacement. Revuts'kyi introduces the concept of "émigré" into the title of his article "Emihratsiina dramaturhiia V. Vynnychenka" but defines the term only in chronological terms, ignoring other important aspects that exile had on Vynnychenko. Volodymyr Panchenko in his doctoral dissertation, *Tvorchist' Volodymyra Vynnychenka 1902-1920 rr. u henetychnykh i typolohichnykh zviazkakh z ievropeis'kymy literaturamy* [The Writings of Volodymyr Vynnychenko in 1902-1920 in Its Generic and Typological Links with European Literatures] deals with Vynnychenko's writings from 1902 to 1920, comparing generic and typological similarities between him and writers, such as Dostoyevsky, Gorky, Maupassant, d'Annunzio, Ibsen, Zola, and Hamsun. Although he presents important archival materials concerning Vynnychenko's displacement, he does not focus on how it impacted his writing. He excludes from his study, for example, the key novel *Rivnovaha* [Equilibrium] (1912), which is crucial for understanding the writer's transformation under exilic conditions.[6] Halyna Syvachenko is the only scholar who has made an attempt to approach Vynnychenko's writings from the perspective of displacement in her most recent book, *Prorok ne svoieii Vitchyzny. Ekspatriants'kyi 'metaroman' Volodymyra Vynnychenka: tekst i kontekst* [A Prophet Not of His Homeland. Vynnychenko's Expatriate 'Metanovel': Text and Context] (2003). However, in her analysis she omits Vynnychenko's early displaced works (1907-14), as well as later works with Ukrainian themes (i.e., *Pisnia Izrailia, Zakon, Namysto*)—questions that I shall address in my thesis.

It would be insufficient to argue, however, that new developments in Vynnychenko's writing were conditioned simply by his displacement. We have to consider his general evolution as a writer, recognizing the influence of the modernist *fin de siécle* period, as well as Marx, Darwin, Nietzsche, Freud, and others. The formation of Vynnychenko as a writer stems directly from this turbulent time, when cardinal changes in all spheres of life—social, cultural, national, religious—were taking place. As Virginia Wolf observes: "On or about December 1910 human nature changed... All human relations shifted—those between masters and servants, husbands and wives, parents and children. And when human relations change there is at the same time a change in religion, conduct, politics, and literature" (qt. in Bradbury and McFarlane, 33). Nevertheless, I maintain that displacement contributed significantly to the evolution of Vynnychenko as a writer—and in specific ways determined his social, cultural, and philosophical outlook, ideological preoccupations, vision of homeland society, not to mention his attitudes toward the hostland, as well as choice of themes and settings.

---

[6] Panchenko later published a monograph based on his dissertation, *Budynok z khymeramy. Tvorchist' V. Vynnychenka v 1900-1920 rr. u ievropeis'komu literaturnomu konteksti* (1998) [A House with Chimeras. V. Vynnychenko's Writings in the European Literary Context, 1900-1920]. In my dissertation I refer to the thesis available on the Internet, http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko.

The aim of my dissertation is to show how displacement as a specific social and cultural phenomenon influenced Vynnychenko the writer and how it is reflected in his works. The dissertation is structured in chronological order to show the dynamics of the writer's literary development and responses to the challenges of his displacement. Although he remained abroad until his death in 1951, the cut-off point of this work is the year 1925.

In Chapter One, I present an overview of Vynnychenko as a displaced writer, who lived most of his life and wrote the majority of his works outside his homeland. Then I discuss the theoretical issues of displaced writings, which serve as the methodological basis for my study. Viewing the concept of identity as one that is in a constant process of "negotiation," I use displacement as a "blanket" term for viewing a displaced writer in his/her negotiation among various states of displacement—exile, émigré, expatriate, diaspora, traveler, and nomad. I also demonstrate how this theoretical framework fits Vynnychenko's case and how it diverges from it, thus revealing the writer's unique experience.

In Chapter Two, I examine how the displaced condition in Europe influenced Vynnychenko's writings during 1907-14. Specifically, starting from a general overview of displacement as an important attribute of Modernism, I discuss Vynnychenko as a displaced modernist writer and show how his relationship with the homeland and the hostland informs his displaced states of traveler, émigré, expatriate, and exile.

In Chapter Three, I analyze Vynnychenko's second displacement (1920-25) in Czechoslovakia and Weimar Germany. Examining his responses to the new postwar social and cultural milieu, I show how they impact his transition from "old" themes to his utopian novel *Soniachna mashyna*. In my study I focus on the connection between utopia and displacement, ideological and stylistic aspects, and the reception of the novel in the homeland and hostland.

In the Conclusion, I review the main points of my study and outline Vynnychenko's next developments for the period 1925-51.

CHAPTER ONE

BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND AND THEORETICAL PREMISES

In this chapter I shall present a general overview of Vynnychenko-the-writer for the period 1907-25 from the perspective of displacement, discuss the issues of displaced writings in the literary discourse as the theoretical framework for this study, and show how this framework fits Vynnychenko's case.

1.1. Arrivals and Departures: A Biographical Overview

Vynnychenko was born on 28 July 1880 in the city of Ielysavethrad (Kirovohrad today) in the steppe region of south-central Ukraine (at that time a part of the Russian Empire) to a poor peasant family. After graduating from the gymnasium in 1899 he wandered through the country, following the common practice of the revolutionary intelligentsia in the Russian Empire. The goal of "khodinnia v narod" [going to the people] was to observe the life of various strata of the population. "Such wanderings," observes Panchenko "were part of the creative process, as they gave Vynnychenko material for creating that artistic panorama of the life of lower-class Ukrainians who appear in his numerous stories at the beginning of the twentieth century" (http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p3.shtml#1.3.%20). They were also connected with the socialist ideals of the intelligentsia, which had as its goals the enlightenment of the illiterate peasantry and to improve social conditions in society at large. The Russian writer Maxim Gorky, who also engaged in such "wanderings," elaborated at length on them in his writings.[1] Vynnychenko's predisposition to traveling may also have been related to his "steppe temperament," i.e., love of large open spaces, movement, even nomadism. Hence, the image of the steppe will haunt the writer throughout his life. His love of freedom, his individualism, which bordered on anarchism, was typical of the steppe region.[2] He combined these traits with a belief in rationalism and the need to transform society and human relationships.

Eventually Vynnychenko arrived in Kyiv where he entered the Faculty of Law at Kyiv University and joined the revolutionary movement—in 1902 he became a membe of the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party (RUP). After its split in 1905 Vynnychenko joined the Ukrainian Social-Democratic Workers' Party (USDWP) and became one of its leaders. He was arrested on 4 February 1902 and forcefully conscripted into the army in fall of that year. Deserting from the army on 1 February 1903 Vynnychenko escaped abroad to Galicia, the part of Ukraine that was under Austro-Hungary. There he collaborated with Galician social democrats and radicals, writing articles for the newspapers *Pratsia* [Labour] and *Selianyn* [Peasant][3] and smuggling revolutionary literature into Eastern Ukraine. In July 1903 Vynnychenko was arrested while crossing the border into Ukraine with a false Austro-Hungarian passport. He was convicted to one and a half years of service in a military disciplinary unit. After his release, Vynnychenko finished his programme of studies at the university. Instead of starting a career, he resumed his wanderings throughout Ukraine, seeking impressions of everyday life and conducting his literary and political activity until he was next arrested in the fall of 1906.

---

[1] Starting in 1890, he began wandering from his home town Nizhnii Novgorod to Tsaritsyn (today Volgograd), the Don, the Kuban' and the Black Sea regions, the Crimea, Ukraine, and Bessarabia. His travels resulted in a number of works, primarily about vagabonds, including such stories as "Makar Chudra" (1892), Emelian Piliai" (1893), and "Chelkash" (1895), which instantly brought him literary prominence.

[2] The most powerful anarchist movement during the Russian revolution, headed by Nestor Makhno, originated in the steppes of Ukraine and managed to establish an "anarchist republic" for a short period. Ievhen Chykalenko, Vynnychenko's close friend and patron of literature, considered him somewhat of an anarchist by nature, even though he was a member of the Socialist Party (1955, 329).

[3] Mykola Zhulyns'kyi claims that Vynnychenko worked for these newspapers, although Vadym Stel'mashenko in his *Annotated Bibliography* does not make any reference to them.

It seems that even in his early years traveling had an influence on the formation of Vynnychenko's literary identity. It contributed to his development as a subtle and objective observer of the life of peasants, workers, criminals, intellectuals, artists, soldiers, students, and revolutionaries. During his several incarcerations, Vynnychenko turned isolation into an inspiration for creativity. It is known that he wrote a number of his works (e.g., "Holota" [The Needy] and *Dyzharmoniia* [Disharmony]) in prison. Later, Vynnychenko continued to write in "inconvenient" places—trains, forests, by the sea. By 1907 he was already recognized as a prose writer by most of the distinguished critics of his time: Ivan Franko, Lesia Ukrainka, Serhii Iefremov, and others. Franko, in particular, expressed a very positive opinion:

> Out of the delicate, artistically refined and weak, or unoriginal and untalented generation of contemporary Ukrainian writers suddenly something powerful, decisive, muscular, and full of temperament has emerged, something that doesn't climb into a pocket for a word, but hails it with streams, that doesn't sow it through a sieve but lumps together, mixed like life itself, Ukrainian and Muscovite, crippled and pure, like silver that is not limited in scopes of its observation and in borders of its plastic creativity. And where did such a one as you come from?—one wants to ask Mr. Vynnychenko after each of his stories (1982, 35: 91).

In May 1907 Vynnychenko was released on bail. While awaiting trial, which would likely lead to conviction and exile to Siberia, Vynnychenko decided, like many revolutionaries, to go into exile in Europe. He would remain there for the period 1907-1914.

Despite the challenges of a long European exile, it was also a very fruitful and, I would say, ground-breaking period in the formation of Vynnychenko as an individual and a writer. He traveled through various European countries (i.e., Switzerland, Austro-Hungary, Italy, France, and Germany), and from time to time made illegal visits to Ukraine and Russia. In the West his contacts with intellectual circles in the Russian Empire included such leading politicians and writers as Maxim Gorky, Anatolii Lunacharskii, Aleksandr Bogdanov, to mention just a few. Though he did not meet Vynnychenko personally, Vladimir Lenin was also familiar with his works. As a party member, Vynnychenko participated in several political gatherings. One of his few articles in this period, "Sposterezhennia neprofesionala. Marksyzm i mystetstvo" [Observations of a Non-Specialist. Marxism and Art] (1913), is a Marxian defence of the utilitarian approach to art. In this respect, he reflects the Eastern European cultural tradition of an "engaged literature," although as an artist he constantly experienced contradiction between the two spheres. More often than not, however, aesthetic principles during this period in his writings overrode ideology, and he helped to introduce from afar new modernist ideas in the homeland society.

To some extent his first displacement freed Vynnychenko from total immersion in politics and turned him into a writer. Deprived of opportunities to engage in immediate political action, he became more preoccupied with literature and culture. In Paris Vynnychenko took part in organizing the Parisian Ukrainian Association, becoming a founder of its artistic section in 1909. He also planned to write a column entitled "Ukraine," for a French magazine. At this time he became interested in painting and cinema. Expatriation contributed significantly to his intellectual growth. At the same time

Vynnychenko made strenuous efforts to advance his own education. He studied French and German, and read literature, history, and philosophy. Among the writers who drew his attention in this period were Nietzsche, Bergson, Zola, Strindberg, Ibsen, and Przybyszewski. Vynnychenko lived in Paris, a modernist cosmopolitan centre, which attracted youth from all over the world, who adopted a Bohemian way of life. One of them was a student of medicine at the Sorbonne, named Rosalia Lifshyts', who was born to a rich Russian Jewish family from the city of Orel (Russia). Vynnychenko and Rosalia were married in 1911.

One of the most important things that displacement gave Vynnychenko—something every creative individual needs—was a perspective, and a sense of distance and detachment from his society. This is probably the most crucial development in Vynnychenko's early career, which determined his more critical attitude to his homeland. Being outside of his country, he established himself as its most prolific and popular writer. The year 1907 marked a shift in his literary career from short realistic stories with descriptions of everyday life to philosophical and moral issues in his plays and novels. Among the contemporary problems of his time, he addressed the following: irrational biological factors versus rational ideological principles (*Memento*, 1909), the individual versus the collective (*Bazar* [Bazaar], 1910), the relativity of falsehood and truth (*Brekhnia* [Lie], 1910), honesty with oneself as an inner moral imperative (*Chesnist' z soboiu* [Honesty with Oneself], 1911), art versus everyday life (*Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* [Black Panther and Polar Bear], 1911), a new perspective on prostitution as a social act (*Zapovit bat'kiv* [Testament of Forefathers] 1914), worship of "small gods"—ideological dogmas (*Po-svii* [For One's Own] 1913, *Bozhky* [Small Gods], 1914), and new family relationships ("Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku" [A Story About Iakym's House], 1912). Through Russian translations and a few original works written in Russian (i.e., *Chesnist' z soboiu*, *Rivnovaha*) he became actively engaged in the imperial discourse, and his works are often compared to such writers as Dostoyevsky, Gorky, Andreiev, Veresaiev, and Artsybashev. Some works were published in other translations.[4]

Being away from his homeland for a considerable amount of time, Vynnychenko finds himself psychologically in a very fragile state. For instance, the mood of an expatriate ("Taina" [A Mystery], 1910) is intertwined and changes gradually into that of an exile (*Rivnovaha*), displaced from his homeland and having nostalgic feeling for it. Having suffered from depression, Vynnychenko projects memory into the past to sustain his identity. The familiar territory of the homeland is evoked in such works as "Zina," "Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku," etc., imbued with more lyricism and sensory memories. The writer returns as far back as to his childhood, associated with his "Golden Age" ("Kumediia z Kostem" [A Funny episode with Kost'] (1909), "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" [Fed'ko the Troublemaker] (1912)). Despite his long stay abroad, Vynnychenko's homeland, Ukraine, remains the main focal point in his writings. Only in four works ("Taina," *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, *Rivnovaha* and "Olaf Stefenzon" [Olaf Stefenzon], 1913) do we have clear hostland setting. But even in these works the writer is more interested in Ukrainian and Russian émigrés (or migrants from other countries) rather than in local people and life. The expatriate is tired and wants to go home despite the danger of arrest. That is the case with Vynnychenko and his wife Rosalia who, disguised in peasant clothing, return home illegally with false passports in 1914.[5]

---

[4] The story "Zina" [Zina] in German translation appeared in the journal *Ukrainische Rundschau* (Wynnytschenko, Wolodymyr. *Sina*. [Vienna], 9-10 (1910): 246-251; 11-12 (1910): 278-284; as well as two editions of his stories in Latvian translation (Stel'mashenko, 66); he also planned to translate and stage his play *Bazar* in France.

In Ukraine Vynnychenko stayed briefly in Katerynoslav until he was discovered by a police agent and forced to leave the city. He moved to Moscow where his wife could work as a nurse taking care of soldiers wounded in the war, while Vynnychenko could focus on his literary work. During this period the writer produced two novels, *Khochu* [I Want] (1916) and *Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelia* [Notes of the Snub-Nosed Mephistopheles] (1917), and his plays (i.e., *Mokhnonohe* [Hairy Monster] (1914) and *Pryhvozhdeni* [The Nailed Down] (1916) were staged in various cities of the Empire, such as Moscow, Samara, Saratov, Kyiv, Kharkiv, Odesa, and Baku. At the same time he collaborated with Ukrainian figures in Moscow (e.g., Symon Petlira, a future Minister of Defense and Head of the Ukrainian Republic, was the most prominent among them), working as an editor for the journal, *Promin'* [Ray] (1916-17). After the abdication of the tsar in 1917, he returned to Kyiv and became actively engaged in political activity. Vynnychenko was appointed the first Prime Minister of an independent Ukraine and headed the revolutionary government against the German and Russian occupations in 1918-1919. He is known as the author of a crucial set of historical documents (i.e., declaration of Ukrainian independence), although his romantic preoccupation with the revolution also brought him the reputation of a "political loser." During the Bolshevik and White Army occupations of Ukraine, he briefly stayed in various European cities (Semmering, Budapest, Leinz, Vienna, and Prague) where he wrote the three-volume historical documentary *Vidrodzhennia natsii* [Revival of the Nation] (Kyiv-Vienna:

---

[5] Vynnychenko was known under various pseudonyms, such as Dede and Valdemar. During his stay in Europe in 1907-14 he corresponded under the name of Volodymyr Starosolski.

Dzvin, 1920), an account of the revolution in Ukraine. In his conflict with Ukrainian émigré circles, Vynnychenko criticized them from an overtly Marxist position for "bourgeois' deviations" and for flirting with Western democracies. All this gradually led to his ostracism by the diaspora and his leftward political turn, as well as his attempt to collaborate with the Bolshevik government in Ukraine. In 1920 he visited Moscow and Kharkiv (Ukraine's capital at that time) to negotiate a new role for himself in the new political situation. However, the communist government in Ukraine did not enjoy real autonomy, being a puppet government in the hands of the Moscow centre. Vynnychenko refused to make any concessions on the national issue and again went into exile, his last.

During what turned out to be his longest and final displacement Vynnychenko resided in Czechoslovakia (Prague and Karlsbad, 1920-1921), Germany (Berlin, Zehlendorf, and Rauen, 1921-1925) and France (Paris, 1925-1934; and Mougins, 1934-1951). The cut-off point of my study is 1925, the year that he moved to France, although I shall make references to the next period, when pertinent to my discussion. After his short stay in Czechoslovakia, where there was quite an active émigré community, the writer decided to move to Germany where he could have more artistic autonomy. The Weimar Republic (1918-33) with its low living costs and inspiring cultural life attracted artists and intelligentsia from various countries. In contrast to his first displacement, Vynnychenko was now more eager to immerse himself in the new cultural environment. He read literature on modern philosophy (Guyau), ethics (Wundt), and psychoanalysis (Stekel); attended artistic exhibitions (Monet, Kokoschka, the German expressionists of the "Sturm" movement), theatres (plays by Schnitzer, Hamsun, Gorky, Ansky, and Shaw), and cinema (*Anne Boleyn*, *Rund um die Ehe*, *Danton*, *Quo Vadis*, and Charlie

Chaplin's films). At this period Vynnychenko was quite successful in promoting his works. His play *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* was made into a German film (1921). His plays, *Brekhnia, Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, and *Hrikh* [Sin]) were especially successful and were staged in various European countries. He had contacts with Russian (the literary group "Skify," the publishing house "Vozrozhdeniie" [Revival]) and German (Kiepenheuer, Specht, Guter) artistic and business circles.

Psychologically, however, the new displacement appeared to be much more traumatic than the first one. Despite the hardships of the earliest exile, Vynnychenko believed in the revolutionary cause and the building of a new society. After 1920 he was psychologically devastated as the Bolsheviks, with whom he had been conducting revolutionary activities and going to build that society, expelled him from the country. In the wake of his political defeat, Vynnychenko was still actively involved in émigré political activity as a member of the Ukrainian Communist Party (its foreign branch, 1920-1921). He wrote extensively for the newspaper *Nova doba* [New Epoch] (Vienna, 1920-1921) and for some time for *Nova Ukraina* [New Ukraine] (Prague, 1922-1923),[6] addressing questions of Russian chauvinism ("Baraniache chornosotenstvo"[7] [Sheepish Black Hundreds]), the world revolution ("Vsesvitnia revoliutsiia" [World Revolution]), peace ("Myru!" [We Want Peace!]), criticism of social democracy ("Shcho take teper ukrains'ka sotsiial-demokratiia?" [What is Ukrainian Social Democracy Now?]), and the future society ("Utopiia i diisnist'" [Utopia and Reality]), to name but a few.[8] As a result he was declared *persona non grata* at the All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets, held in

---

[6] The journal *Nova Ukraina* existed until 1928.

[7] 'Black Hundreds' refers to an extreme chauvinistic organization aimed at the preservation of the Russian Empire.

[8] In *Nova dob*a alone he wrote 33 articles during the period 1920-1921.

Kharkiv from 25 February to 3 March 1921, although his plays and literary works remained in circulation until 1933, when Stalin's centralization of power came into its full strength.

Vynnychenko's political engagement was rather short-lived, as he became more engaged in literature. In 1921, at the start of his last displacement, he was full of creative energy and zeal for literary work. In his works the writer referred mainly to his old experience: the plays *Zakon* [Law] (1921, published in 1922 (Russian) and 1923 (Ukrainian)) and *Pisnia Izrailia* [Song of Israel] (1921), the novel *Na toi bik*, and children's stories based on folklore motifs, *Namysto* (1922). His new universalist stance to work for the whole planet often overlapped with a state of apathy and escapism. His main work of the period, the three-volume novel *Soniachna mashyna*, revealed a cardinal shift in his thematic and stylistic interests toward utopia and adventure style, and ideological preoccupation. Reflecting the economic crisis in Germany in 1923 and anticipation of the capitalist decline in the West, the novel also became a response to Vynnychenko's own feeling of uprootedness. Despite the rather symbolic German setting, the focal point is transformed from the present and the homeland to the future and a utopian "nowhere," which is yet to come. In contrast to the success of his plays, *Soniachna mashyna* appeared to be quite outdated in the West, which was dominated by an anti-utopian discourse. On the other hand, it had a great success in Ukrainian literature in the late 1920s, owing to its genre and stylistic novelty and the fact that it served as a form of escape from stifling Soviet reality.

This overview of Vynnychenko's life identifies the main stages of his literary career and shows how displacement is relevant and important in his life and writings.

Now I would like to turn to the theoretical problems of displacement and highlight how it is viewed in contemporary discourse and how it is relevant to Vynnychenko's case.

1.2. The Issue of Displaced Writings in Literary Discourse

In presenting a broad discussion of the issue of displaced writing in literary discourse, my goal is to substantiate displacement as a relevant concept for my study. As the problem of terms and definitions seems quite intrinsic to studies of displaced writings,[9] I shall address it by showing displacement as a process with a variety of related qualities and characteristics.

Displacement plays a crucial, if not decisive, role in the development of Vynnychenko as a writer. For the purpose of this work I consider displacement as the overarching methodological concept, which defines a variety of experiences in relation to geographical place—exile, émigré, expatriate, diaspora, emigration/immigration, travel and nomadism. I have chosen the terms of "displacement," "displaced writers" and "displaced writings" as the most convenient ones, which helps us study Vynnychenko's works and shows how his different experiences outside his homeland are either reflected in his writings or influenced them. This will allow me, particularly, to study Vynnychenko not only as, say, an exile who longed for and was preoccupied with his homeland, but also as an expatriate who enjoyed his travels, a writer who sought to integrate into a new hostland discourse and an uprooted person with an unclear vision of his future.

---

[9] For instance, Hallvard Dahlie, in his *Varieties of Exile. The Canadian Experience* (1986) devotes his first chapter entirely to "shaping a definition."

My initial intention was to study the writings of Vynnychenko through the prism of "exile." Although this is an important concept (and I will make use of it), I feel that it placed restrictions on the research methodology. It, particularly, bars broader perspectives on Vynnychenko who negotiates his various states of displacement. In the humanities the term became widely accepted after World War II, denoting the status of millions of refugees who had left their homelands as "displaced persons" (DPs).[10] Currently the term "displacement" is extensively used in cultural studies to define the postmodern phenomenon of cultures as cross-cultural ones and exposed to hybridity and transformation. Angelica Bammer, for instance, considers displacement not only as "the separation of people from their native culture either through physical dislocation (as refugees, immigrants, exiles, or expatriates)" but also as "the colonizing imposition of a foreign culture" (xi). An approach more pertinent to my case study was Caren Kaplan's view of travel as a form of displacement with its multiple locations, including real and metaphysical ones. I will use the term primarily in the geographical sense of movement from one country to another, which consequently triggers its broader conceptualization in social, cultural, and psychological terms and its possible application to the study of literature.

The term "displacement" appears to be very relevant to the process of defining a postmodern, complex understanding of identity as one that is in a constant state of formation. In traditional terms, identity is treated as something given, i.e., static, not inclined to changes. According to this approach, an exile can be someone who never accepts a new land and is not affected by changes in different circumstances. However, recent developments in the postmodern discourse have challenged this traditional rhetoric of identity. "It is now widely understood," states James Clifford, "that the old localizing strategies—by bounded *community*, by organic *culture*, by *region*, by *center* and *periphery*—may obscure as much as they reveal" (303). Paul Tabori already speaks about the status of exile as a dynamic one but this dynamism, however, is understood as directed either toward a return to one's homeland or as the beginning of the assimilation process in the new country (37). Taking border as the "only reliable home" for exiles, Marc Robinson already brings us to a dynamic relationship between homeland and hostland (xxii). In newer studies this dynamic is treated as a process of production and negotiation between two or more spaces. Stuart Hall conceptualizes that

---

[10] See, for instance: *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Eds. Wsevolod W. Isajiw, Yury Boshyk, and Roman Senkus. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1992; Wyman, Mark. *DP: Europe's Displaced Persons, 1945-1951*. Philadelphia: Balch Institute Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1989.

> Identity is not as transparent or unproblematic as we think. Perhaps instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, we should think, instead, of identity as a 'production', which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation (222).

For Paul White suggests that

> ...migrants may live in a number of worlds, and move between them on a daily, annual or seasonal rhythm. Other changes resulting from migration include attempts to re-create elements of former lives (possibly accentuating significant icons of that existence into quasi-talismans of high symbolic or ritual significance); attempts to integrate or assimilate completely (which may be blocked by a number of mechanisms within the "host" society); or the creation of a new identity which is characterized by a feeling of independence from both the society of origin and the social structures of the destination. These changes in identity cannot be pinned down to a rigid linear continuum, for they represent the multiple and continually renegotiated outcomes of complex multifaceted phenomena operating both within individual biographies and for societies as a whole (3).

The contemporary concept of contaminated and hybrid identity also reveals this dynamic and "inclusive" nature of displacement:

> The notion of hybridity suggests—most importantly in relation to 'racial' and ethnic identities—that identities are not pure but the product of mixing, fusion, and creolization. Underlying this account of identity is an attention to the mixing and movement of cultures... The resulting fusion or hybridity of identities is not the product of the assimilation of one culture or cultural tradition by another, but the production of something new (Marshall, 295).

Utilizing a new methodological apparatus, Kaplan proposes to deconstruct the monolithic subject of exile with a more complex theory of location and identity. I, however, suggest that all these historical forms of displacement—exile, émigré, emigrant, expatriate, nomad, and diaspora—should not be disregarded in the wake of intense poststructural redefinitions, as they all work in their own way. Methodological difficulties appear when defining displaced writers' experience. Hallvard Dahlie, for example, classifies Henry James as an exile (5). Terry Eagleton sees Joseph Conrad and James as emigrants who "choose English society from the outside" and do not want to go back (14). At the same time, a broader study of Conrad's works suggests that he can also be regarded as an exile and his works—as an attempt to transcend its bitterness (Gurko, Milbauer). From this methodological and theoretical problem arises the concept of displacement as a "blanket term." We need to recognize that writing in displacement is an on-going process of redefinition and negotiation between homeland and hostland. Exile, émigré, emigrant, expatriate, nomad, and diaspora may be different phases and qualities of this negotiation. They may overlap or succeed each other and may depend on a number of factors, such as duration of displacement, the relationship between homeland and hostland, adjustment to a new society, as well as the age and personality of writers.

In terms of the relationship between the two opposites, the homeland and the hostland, based on a chronological change, scholars define three major phases of displacement: 1) an imaginary return home, often with a new vision of it, and intense rediscovery of the past and longing for it; 2) a clash with a new society and attempts to adjust to it; 3) adjustment to a new society or, in the case of failure, marginalization and even death. This state of "in-betweenness" determines the quality of displacement. An imaginary return is very typical of the majority of writers at the beginning of their displacement, as it grants them a sense of home, "familiar territory," artistic sensitivity, and narrative imagination. As Michael Seidel notes: "An exile is someone who inhabits one place and remembers or projects the reality of another" (ix). In other words, this is the position of being in one place (hostland) and writing for another place (homeland) (works of displaced writers, however, are often not allowed in their home countries, especially on political grounds, which circumstance creates an additional challenge). Attempts to adjust to a new society are an enduring and complicated process both in social and literary terms. Deprived of the social status they enjoyed at home, exiles are forced to start from scratch to meet their living needs in a new social environment; in literary terms, they experience bewilderment and confusion arising from the necessity to make a variety of choices: who are the readers? Are they still in the homeland or already in the hostland? Is it necessary to switch to a different language? If so, how to cope with linguistic difficulties? And the final result of displacement is either adjustment to a new society—as in the case of the emigrant writers Joseph Skvorecky, Michael Ondaatje, and

Rohinton Mistry in Canada—or marginalization within a narrow circle of compatriots, or failure to reach their audience in the homeland.

There are, however, more specific discussions of the evolution of displacement and its phases. Speaking about diaspora, Robin Cohen tries to classify it as a process and posits the following model: 1) dispersal from an original homeland, often traumatic; 2) alternatively, expansion from the homeland in search of work, in pursuit of trade to further colonial ambitions; 3) collective memory and myth about the homeland; 4) idealization of the supposed ancestral home; 5) a return movement; 6) strong ethnic group consciousness sustained over a long time; 7) a troubled relationship with host societies; 8) a sense of solidarity with fellow ethnics in other countries; 9) the possibility of a distinctive creative, enriching life in tolerant host countries (180). The first two phases, in fact, represent two different forms of departure, so they do not work together in the same evolutional line. But the rest can represent different phases of the evolution and negotiation of identity in displacement, though not all could be equally relevant to the analysis of a particular piece of writing. We must also take into account the fact that Cohen's model primarily concerns group identity, which evolves over a certain period of time.

A lone, displaced intellectual naturally feels more alienated than a person situated within a community. Moreover, an intellectual migrant seems to face greater challenges in everyday life, as is attested by German exiles after 1933: "...[T]he exiled intellectual usually led an isolated existence, withdrawing to his living quarters to do his work, unlike a farm or factory worker who comes in contact daily with other people and thus assimilates more quickly socially and linguistically" (Pfanner, 15). It is likely that today's globalized reality gives a displaced person more choices. The most important lesson for us, however, is the dynamic nature and general direction of the evolution of one's identity in displacement, which begins with the trauma of forced departure and then proceeds through a series of obstacles, tending toward adaptation to a new society. As Martin Tucker points out, "Exile is a living tissue that grows in stages and degrees" (xxiv). Thus, Katherine Mansfield started as an expatriate but became an exile (Gurr, 36); German exiles grew into a diaspora because most of them remained in the US, adjusted to a new way of life, and did not return after the war (Pfanner, 147). For Robinson, however, exiles "... are never able to settle fully on either side... They peer ahead, yet look back over their shoulders. They hold their ground, yet ponder the many available directions. They feel the fullness of the earth supporting their weight—there is so little earth to call their own—yet they could also float away at any moment" (xxii). In any case, displacement comprises a number of characteristics varying between two extremes: total rejection and adaptation to displacement.

Now I will focus on historical aspects of various forms of displacement, surveying various connotations of related terms. This includes exile, émigré, expatriate, diaspora, emigration/immigration, travel and nomadism.

The exile's rich semantic field includes not only "physical exile," but also "spiritual exile" or "inner exile." In religious terms, men are all in "exile from heaven, their true home and destination," with Adam and Eve the first exiles in the Christian tradition (Lagos-Pope, 9). It was usual for religious mystics to practice a kind of spiritual, or, as Bettina Knapp calls it, "esoteric exile," including "introversion, martyrdom, self-abasement—in an attempt to reject the ephemeral joys of the here-and-now, thus making them worthy of eternal beatitude in the world to come" (5). For John Donne, for instance, the true home was rather with God (qt. in Gurr, 13):

> For though through many straits, and lands I roam,
> I launch at paradise, and I sail towards home
> ("The Progress of the Soul")

Inner exile is supposed to be more attributable to modern times, engendered by technological revolution, social unrests, totalitarian ideologies, and migration of masses of uprooted people. Many men of letters remain at home in inner exile, a kind of ivory tower, and many of them (Joyce, Hemingway, Elliot, Pound, and others) prefer to leave their homelands voluntarily and go into physical exile. Some scholars (Ilie, Gurr) even suggest ignoring the difference between outer and inner exile, since they both experience displacement from the centre and share a common psychological crisis. It is accepted that any major artist and truly creative mind is a foreigner in his own land. Other scholars, however, criticize this approach. Dahlie, for example, commenting on Andrew Gurr's *Writers in Exile*, finds it "quite uncomplicated and straightforward" to say that all writers are born in a kind of exile (16). I too consider that the psychological experience of alienation might be common for both "inner" and "outer" exiles, but they are not identical. For the purpose of this research I suggest distinguishing these two generic concepts and will apply only the primary concept of outer exile, viewed as a geographical displacement from one country to another, and their different social and cultural environments. This movement engenders specific features of displacement, such as distance, a new attitude toward the homeland, a nostalgic feeling for a lost place, the influence of the hostland, the writer's deracination and hesitation between different cultural spaces, isolationism and a more universal perspective, issues of language, and reader response. None of these are typical of inner exile.

History shows us that displacement is an intrinsic characteristic of human civilization, starting from the first nomadic movements. The practice of exile and diaspora begins already in settled and socially organized societies. Historically speaking, exile (Latin: *ex* 'out of', *salire* 'to leap', *exilium* 'banishment'), seems to be the most established term for human displacement, which is also widely used to denote the literary experience of exiles. According to *The Oxford Encyclopedic English Dictionary* (1996), exile is traditionally viewed as one of the historical forms of displacement that is "(1) expulsion, or the state of being expelled, from one's native land or (internal exile) native town; (2) long absence abroad, especially enforced" (491). Paul Tabori dates the first known human experience of exile, the story of Sinuhe, as far back as 2000 B.C., which was documented on an Egyptian papyrus (43). It is likely that limited social mobility, a settled way of life, and minimal knowledge of "the other" in geographical and cultural terms determined human physical expulsion from the homeland in early societies as one of the most severe forms of punishment, almost equivalent to death. It is well known, for example, that individuals condemned to death in ancient Greece and Rome had a choice to leave the country. Still, for some, exile was even worse than death because it deprived them of the natural right to be buried in their homeland. Hence, the metaphor of death became very typical for exile in cultural and literary discourse:

> For exile hath more terror in his look,
> Much more than death…
>
> (William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*)[11]

---

[11] Cited in http://www.shakespeare-online.com/plays/romeo_3_3.html

Significantly, in the twentieth century Boris Pasternak articulated this association with death when he refused to accept the Nobel prize in fear of not being allowed to return home: "A departure beyond the borders of my country is for me equivalent to death" (qt. in Levin, 63). An opposite metaphor of rebirth and restoration, symbolizing one's redefinition and rediscovery, is the other side of the coin and is rather a privilege of emigrants—displaced persons who are preoccupied with starting a new life in a new place.

Ovid, known as the first exile writer, symbolizes the bitterness of geographical displacement: removed from Rome, the centre of the Empire, to its periphery on the Black Sea in the first century AD, he feels alienated in a strange environment (i.e., *Tristia, Epistulae ex Ponto*):

> "Here it is I that am a barbarian, understood by nobody"
>
> (qt. in Dahlie, 2)

Other exile writers were Petrarch, Erasmus, and Voltaire, who were not so estranged, having the possibility to communicate in Latin all over Europe as citizens of "The International Republic of Letters." The feeling of exile grew concomitantly with the rise of nationalism in the wake of the French revolution (Levin, 69-70). The concept of nation as a home for "imagined communities" begins to compete with that of religion (Benedict Anderson). National languages and cultures become an important instrument in maintaining individual and collective identities. Now displacement also takes the form of a mass political exodus producing "émigrés." Typical examples of such exoduses are French (after the French revolution), Polish (after the uprisings of 1830-31 and 1863-64), German (after 1933), and Russian and Ukrainian (after 1917 and 1945). Historically, the term "émigré" acquires specifically rooted connotations, bringing to mind the French royalists, who fled the French Revolution. Having political underpinning, the term "émigré" is currently used to denote an active attitude towards homeland and a strong desire to influence the situation there, whereas exiles are more preoccupied with nostalgic feelings and a focus on the past. Sometimes it is, however, problematic to draw the line between these two concepts and they are often used interchangeably. Interestingly, George Brandes, who was among the first literary critics to define the phenomenon of migration and literature, applied the term "emigrant literature" to the writings of European émigrés in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Among those writers who endured the hardship of political exodus were Victor Hugo, Madame de Staël, François-René de Chateaubriand, Ivan Bunin, Vladimir Nabokov, Thomas Mann, and Stefan Zweig.

Along with involuntary displacement there is also voluntary displacement, which includes travelers, expatriates, emigrants/immigrants, and nomads. Travel literature always implies temporary displacement and, thus, more psychological stability. All travel writers, starting from Marco Polo, were confident that they could return home, so they mainly focused on exploring places, adventures, and exoticism, along with self-observation and a new look at the homeland from the fresh perspective of distance. Among travelers are pilgrims, who are propelled by spiritual rejuvenation and the hope that "cultural shrines" (e.g., Athens, Rome, and Paris) will give them creative inspiration. Such were the voyages of George Byron, John Keats, Percy Shelley, and Nikolai Gogol [Mykola Hohol'] in the nineteenth century and many modernist writers at the beginning of the twentieth century.

With the rise of capitalism, writers begin to feel alienated as never before, and this alienation prompted them to adopt a kind of self-imposed exile as a necessary condition of creativity. The stance of a true modernist writer is associated with displacement. It is often accompanied by geographical movement from one country to another, as in the case of James Joyce and Samuel Beckett.

"Expatriates" combine alienation from their society with the advantages that displacement offers them. They range from temporary escapees from social and cultural disturbances in the homeland to travelers and hedonistic escapees in search of new impressions and exoticism. In semantic terms, the word "expatriate" is likely the most neutral in defining displacement. It originates from the Latin *ex* 'out of' and *patria* 'native country.' *The Oxford Dictionary* gives us two definitions of expatriate: "(1) living abroad, especially for a long period; (2) expelled from one's country; exiled." Although the second definition implies a forced displacement and thus parallels exile, in literary criticism the term "expatriate" is usually used to define a lesser degree of displacement, namely voluntary (Tucker, xvi). The most obvious difference between exiles and expatriates is that the latter are not prohibited from returning home, and they have the psychological confidence that they can go back at any time. In modern times a classical example is American expatriates in Europe during the 1920s. This was a revolt of young artists against puritanism and capitalism, which led them to a Bohemian way of life and traveling, and resulted in intense creativity. "By expatriating himself, by living in Paris, Capri or the South of France, the artist can break the puritan shackles, drink, live freely and be wholly creative" (Cowley, 61). In time, however, expatriates may experience that the space in which they arrived has the same problems as the space from which they departed; this helps them to redefine their identities, get rid of an inferiority complex, and return home. Geographical displacement, for instance, helped James Baldwin to realize "that one's identity as an American is to be found only in Europe" (Washington, 109).

The term "emigrants" also constitutes a thread to displacement that is mainly of a socioeconomic nature. To emigrate (Latin: *migrare* 'depart') is to leave one's country to settle in another (*The Oxford*, 460). The principal difference between emigrants, on the one hand, and exiles and émigrés, on the other, is that the former deliberately prepare themselves for voluntary departure from the homeland to start a new life, whereas the latter are forced to do so and would come back as soon as circumstances allowed. Although this difference in initial intention is very significant in defining both groups, it does not mean, however, that they would not be exposed to the same psychological challenge of displacement, say, alienation or nostalgia. As Eric Hobsbawm notes: "Migration is not necessarily exile, though there is no sharp line that separates the economic migrant, even the one who eventually stays, from the exile who cannot go back but wants to. Both remain linked to the old country by the strongest bonds" (65). It is likely that emigrants are more ready to overcome hardships of arrival and more easily to adapt to the new space, whereas exiles and émigrés are located more ambiguously between two spaces since they are not sure whether to wait for a return or start adjusting to a new social and cultural milieu. On the other hand, not only emigrants but also exiles and émigrés, if they decide to integrate into a new society, may transform themselves into proper emigrants. The first wave of Ukrainian emigrants in the 1890s to the North American continent belongs to this kind of displacement. Emigrant writers are largely preoccupied with local themes and can be claimed by the local discourses. A good example is the novel *Sons of the Soil* by Illia Kiriak, which was written in Ukrainian and later translated into English. The importance of the theme of pioneer life in the Canadian prairies reveals, in particular that the novel is likely to be more significant in the Canadian than Ukrainian literary discourse. Another prominent Ukrainian emigrant writer, Myroslav Irchan, decided, however, to return home, although he had already started to write on local Canadian themes (Mandryka). Some scholars also use the term "immigrant literature,"[12] which allows us to view this literature from a different perspective—how it adjusts and contributes to a new space (Neijmann).

Due to the phenomenon of cross-cultural hybridity and social mobility in today's globalized world, there is a tendency to speak in terms of diasporic and nomadic identities within the contemporary postmodern discourse. Diaspora (from the Greek: *dia* 'through', 'throughout'; *spora* 'sowing', 'scattering', 'dissemination'; hence, the English 'spore', 'spread', 'sperm') was first used to denote Greek colonists settling in new places. Later the term was redefined mainly to denote a state of dispersion from the homeland, primarily in relation to the classical diasporas—Jewish, Armenian, and Greek. However, recent changes after World War II, which led to the era of postcolonialism, postmodernism, and a global market economy, have resulted in a new redefinition of the term. As Khachig Tölölyan points out in "A Note from the Editor" in the first issue of a new, specialized journal *Diaspora*:

> Three decades ago, "diaspora" was a term of self-description for a few communities—Jewish, Armenian, and Greek—and barely an operating concept in history and some of the social sciences. Today, the term and the semantic domain in

---

[12] From the Latin: *immigrare* 'to enter and usually become established; to come into a country of which one is not a native for permanent residence'.

> which it functions—diaspora, transnationalism, ethnicity, exile—is repeatedly appropriated by various disciplinary (and polemical) endeavors, and redefined along the way (241).

Nomadism[13] is a modern concept of a mobile, globalized society denoting a kind of traveling writer who seems not to be strongly rooted in any particular place and does not own a fixed home or centre. These individuals celebrate mobility and diversity, being convinced that the whole world belongs to them. As John Peters notes: "For nomads, home is always mobile... in nomadism, home is always already there, without any hope or dream of a homeland. Nomadism sunders the notion of home from a specific site or territory, being homeless and home-full at once" (21).

This overview of terms related to displacement thus helps us to see it as a dynamic form of human migrant experience that varies from its total negative perception to its positive celebration. Exiles and émigrés look back and have a sense of longing; emigrants/immigrants integrate and adapt themselves to new surroundings; expatriates are confident of their return and enjoy their displacement; nomads are not rooted in any particular place and may have homes everywhere; diasporas occupy multiple locations combining two or more spaces. For instance, discussing Rohinton Mistry's Canadian writings, Ranu Samantrai reveals these multiple connections: "The fact that Mistry's work is also claimed by Indians as Indian fiction and by Parsis as Parsi fiction suggests a breakdown and an overlap of nations such that it is unclear where India ends and Canada begins" (34). It is important to note that not all of these categories are equally applicable to Vynnychenko. While exile, émigré, travel, and expatriation are dominant in his displacement, the rest (emigration/immigration, diaspora, and nomadism) are barely visible.

---

[13] Nomad (from the Greek *nemo* 'to pasture') is 1) a member of a pastoral people roaming from place to place for fresh pasture; 2) a wanderer (*The Oxford*, 986).

All these forms of displacement are not isolated and may overlap, revealing the dominance of one over another or their clashes in shaping the identity of displaced writers. Viewing different forms of displacement in the historical continuum, we can see how they change with the social progress of civilization. If we place Vynnychenko in this framework, he, unlike, say, Ovid, experienced higher social mobility, he knew Europe well, his plays were staged in many European cities and he could travel home for a few days if circumstances allowed. At the same time the displaced condition of, say, Naipaul seems at first glance to be more privileged due to a higher level of his social mobility. "A hundred years ago," says Czeslaw Milosz, "average people not familiar with remote regions of the globe quietly relegated them to the realm of the legendary or at least the exotic. Today, however, they feel they are offered the means to embrace places and events of the whole Earth simultaneously" (283). Even though all these exiles have common psychological feelings of loss or "life led outside habitual order" (Said 1994, 149), we notice differences among them. A contemporary exile, thus, has more choices: not only to feel longing for a lost homeland but to adapt to a new society and even to influence it. But we must take into account individual characteristics, such as age, cultural background, congruence of homeland and hostland cultures, and personal aptitude to negotiate past and present social and cultural spaces.

Geographical movement, being an important factor for intellectual freshness and reinforcement, has its drawbacks and benefits for creativity. The natural predicament of exile usually urged scholars to treat it as unfavourable for creativity. For instance, J.

Priestly (1927) suggests that "...[T]he best books are always written at home" (qt. in Tabori, 166-167). However, postmodernist critics find this issue more controversial. They believe that one should take into account different aspects of displacement. Eagleton gives us an interesting example of a radically different reality: among seven major British writers (Conrad, James, Eliot, Pound, Yeats, Joyce, and Lawrence) in the first part of the 20th century, only one was native-born, Lawrence. As Eagleton explains: "[I]ndigenous English writing, caught within its partial and one-sided attachments, [was unable] to "totalise" the significant movements of its own culture" (15). Dahlie, on the other hand, has a more differentiated approach on this account:

> Exile as a state of physical residency or as a state of mind can undoubtedly generate in some artists a strong impulse towards creativity, but others it might render absolutely barren. [...] [A]s a group as is undoubtedly true of similar groups in all nations, they are in creative artistry more or less equal to any group of indigenous writers (201).

Dahlie's approach seems more balanced. I would like also to emphasize how displacement can be enormously creative of certain categories of writers. For some writers literature becomes the only home or they create a so-called 'Republic of Letters' within a broader community. Still for others "writing surpasses literature: writing becomes either a vehicle for memories and hopes or a totally self-enclosed shell" (Rubchak, 101). Gurr, examining displaced writings of Katherine Mansfield, Naipaul, and Ngugi Wa Thiang'o, concludes that "...without exile, [these] writers... would have produced a radically different, and I would suggest a lesser body of work" (143). In this critic's opinion, the reason lies in the fact that an exile experiences "the clearer sense of his own identity which his home gives him" (9). Said belongs to those who strongly express his attitude towards displacement as a human tragedy, but he accepts at the same time its enriching influence on culture, where displaced writers look for their compensatory opportunities. "Modern Western culture—according to Said—is in large part the work of exiles, émigrés, refugees" (1994, 137). It is not surprising then, that there are so many Nobel prize recipients among displaced authors: Bunin, Cortázar, Neruda, Jiménes, Asturias, Nabokov, Singer, Milosz, Canetti, Brodsky, Naipaul. One should also take into account that displaced writers are, as a rule, the best writers in their respective homelands, who confront all problematic issues of their societies and that is why they are usually primary targets of authoritarian regimes, which would not tolerate such a heresy and expel them from their motherlands.

1.3. Vynnychenko within the Theoretical Framework of Displacement: General Overview

In many respects Vynnychenko's case falls into the theoretical framework of displacement presented above. During the first period of exile (1907-14) the writer was mainly preoccupied with his homeland, he wrote for the Ukrainian audience, extensively contributed to the intellectual discussion, and set his narratives predominantly in Ukraine. His second displacement during 1920-25 shows greater distance from the homeland and efforts to enter the social and cultural space of the hostland. Yet, we cannot say that Vynnychenko's displacement from the homeland to the hostland follows a strictly lineal development; in fact, it zigzags from one extreme to another. Our definition of displacement implies that this is a constant evolutionary process of negotiation and redefinition among different social and cultural spaces. For instance, while focusing on Ukraine in his early period, to be sure, at the same time he touches upon the hostland milieu ("Taina," *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid,' Rivnovaha*, and "Olaf Stefenzon").

This pattern is modified during 1920-25 when Vynnychenko moves from Ukrainian themes (e.g., *Zakon, Pisnia Izrailia*) to the utopian "nowhere" in *Soniachna mashyna.*

We can also see how different forms of displacement coexist and overlap in Vynnychenko's writings. Within the given theoretical framework, Vynnychenko can be viewed as a traveler and expatriate. His is the creative consciousness of a modernist artist of the *fin de siécle*—mobile, uprooted, attached to large urban centres and charged with the quest for new aesthetic and philosophical values. We can speak about Vynnychenko's new experience, observations, contacts, intellectual growth; his mastering of foreign languages and literatures; his leisure time and delight in art. Although the homeland remains a constant focal point, as a traveler Vynnychenko enjoys the hostland. It helps him assume a modernist stance of detachment and gives him a perspective that broadens his vision of the world as well as the homeland society.

We can also speak about Vynnychenko as an émigré who takes an active political and cultural stance towards his homeland. His works are aimed at the transformation of Ukrainian society, often in radical and controversial ways. The writer's émigré preoccupation is more evident during the first displacement. During 1920-25 he gradually loses his authority and influence in the homeland as a logical result of his long absence and dim possibility of return. Nevertheless, he constantly follows the pulse of Ukrainian life. *Soniachna mashyna*, for instance, can be viewed as a form of his ideological discussion with the Soviets about the future communist society.

Vynnychenko, of course, finds himself exiled from his homeland and deprived of political rights. In the early stage (1907-14) he experiences his departure more emotionally and often risks arrest to return illegally to Ukraine. Feelings of nostalgia and longing for the past visit him regularly and manifest themselves in his writings (i.e., *Rivnovaha* and his children's stories). It seems that with time (after 1920) exilic feelings abate as Vynnychenko reorients himself to the present and future, and adjusts to the new circumstances. But, in fact, they remain constant, as though submerged, and appear sporadically throughout his lifetime (children's stories for the collection *Namysto*). On the other hand, with vague prospects for the future and due to his constant conflicts with the homeland (e.g., literary critics and politicians), Vynnychenko found himself in a state of existential crisis that aroused his escapist tendencies and a desire to emigrate.

Vynnychenko's displacement cannot be fully analyzed without mentioning his contacts with other Ukrainians abroad, i.e., the diaspora. The writer had a complex relationship with the diaspora. In 1907-14 émigrés were united in opposition to tsarist rule, while in 1920-25 they were divided in relation to a number of factors—their attitude toward socialism and democracy, the Bolsheviks, and various Ukrainian factions (e.g., socialists, communists, monarchists). Eventually, he becomes skeptical of émigré efforts to restore Ukrainian statehood, and critical of the ethnographic representation of the Ukrainian identity in the West. Vynnychenko prefers artistic autonomy, a kind of ivory tower, to pursue his literary goals.

Despite the fact that Vynnychenko betrays patterns similar to other displaced writers and falls into the established theoretical framework, in this dissertation I will introduce the special characteristics that are unique to him and help to distinguish his experience as a displaced writer among other writers. Firstly, how is it that Vynnychenko lived for a long period of time in exile and yet was one of the most acclaimed writers in his homeland? What is the consequence of being in one place, but writing for an audience in another? The tragedy of exiled writers is that they are usually excluded from their national literary process, prevented from conducting a mutual dialogue. Very few exile writers can boast of simultaneous displacement from, and presence in, the homeland. For instance, the writings of Nabokov, Bunin, Milosz, and Kundera were forbidden in their countries until the political situation changed. For a considerable period of time—first during the Russian Empire (1907-1917) and then during the Soviet period (1920s)—Vynnychenko's works found their way, albeit with some censorship, to readers and were enormously popular.

From this issue springs the general direction of my inquiry: what is Vynnychenko's relationship to his homeland and how does it develop in relation to specific individual and historical factors. As mentioned earlier, during his first displacement he is largely preoccupied with the intellectual discussion in Ukraine. His highly provocative modernist themes in his works meet with very ardent responses, both positive and negative. This presence in the Ukrainian literary process, no doubt, stimulates the writer's creativity and gives him a sense of strong national preoccupation, self-analysis, and more indulgence to engage in the abstract world of ideas that concern Ukrainian society. Displacement gives Vynnychenko a perspective that he would most likely have lacked at home, not to mention individual freedom.

The presence of the past and nostalgia are important characteristics of a displaced writer's connection with the homeland. In Vynnychenko's case, this is particularly conveyed through a number of aesthetical modalities, including lyrical prologues, landscapes, preoccupation with climate, and realistic description in his early works (e.g., "Zina," *Rivnovaha*). His children's stories can also be considered an important part of

Vynnychenko's homecoming. In literary criticism children's literature is approached from a variety of perspectives—pedagogical, moral, and narrative, but rarely from a perspective of displacement. In Ukrainian literary criticism no one has attempted to analyze Vynnychenko's highly popular children's stories from this perspective. It is indeed paradoxical that his stories, such as "Kumediia z Kostem" (1909) and "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" (1912) were written at a time when he was totally absorbed in the life of the revolutionary and artistic intelligentsia. I will argue that his children's writings may be viewed as a manifestation of his nostalgia for the "Golden Age," which forms his connection between the present and the past to sustain his writer's identity in extreme conditions of displacement.

My thesis reveals how displacement works through a certain period of time, which is full of cardinal historical, political, and cultural changes. The chronological division into two periods, 1907-14 and 1920-25, will show how these changes affected Vynnychenko's stay abroad. His attitude toward Ukraine changes once his final displacement starts in 1920. He seems to be shocked by the revolutionary events and by the fact that he has been expelled not by his opponents from tsarist Russia but his former colleagues-in-arms, the Bolsheviks. Vynnychenko does not recognize Bolshevik rule in Ukraine, but ideologically shares the same communist ideas. At the same time he disdains bourgeois Europe, which gave him asylum, and prophesies its decline. Still popular as a writer in Ukraine during 1920-25, Vynnychenko could not reach the Ukrainian audience with his new works because of the political predisposition of the Soviet authorities. Also, he began to feel a generational gap between himself and younger writers, who were preoccupied with post-revolutionary reality. These conflicts are very specific for Vynnychenko and cause his psychological dividedness and escapism. The writer is suspended between his homeland and hostland and is in search of a new identity in post-war Europe. As a result, he finds himself uprooted from the present and more absorbed in the world of ideas and projections of the future utopian society in *Soniachna mashyna*.

Many critics (e.g., Pavlychko, Shumylo, Koznarsky) consider Vynnychenko a writer who is oriented toward his homeland. Strangely enough, many of them do not consider his early writings (1907-1914) as displaced writings at all. It seems that Vynnychenko's full-fledged presence in the Ukrainian literary discourse and his Ukrainian themes in this period mislead critics. In the most recent book about Vynnychenko's expatriation, *Prorok ne svoieii Vitchyzny*, Syvachenko starts her analysis only with *Soniachna mashyna*. Interestingly enough, even when she discusses Vynnychenko's last period, she omits his works that have Ukrainian themes (i.e., *Pisnia Izrailia*, *Zakon*, *Namysto*, and *Nad*) without any explanation. My approach deconstructs such one-sided perspectives of the writer. Vynnychenko's displacement is, in fact, a constant negotiation between his homeland and hostland, and I shall try to underscore the significance of both spaces and the way they interact.

Within this broad issue of Vynnychenko's relationship to the hostland, I would like to single out a number of other problems that are pertinent to the perspective of displacement. First of all, this is his exploration of the exile condition in his largely neglected novel *Rivnovaha* and in such stories as "Taina" and "Olaf Stefenzon." It is interesting to monitor how the mood of the protagonists changes in these works, depending on the personal circumstances of the author.

Speaking about Vynnychenko as a traveler and expatriate, I specifically indicate his retreat from political activity in favour of art and beauty. The Bohemian way of life and the very international atmosphere of European Modernism find their way into his works set in the hostland—*Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* (1911) and "Olaf Stefenzon." My approach will help to examine these works from an "unvisited perspective."

One fact that supports the argument that Vynnychenko was interested not only in the homeland but also in the hostland discourse is that he constantly sought to translate, stage, or publish his works in other countries. But whereas during his first displacement he accomplishes little in this regard, during 1920-25 he puts enormous efforts to promote his works and to be recognized worldwide. The most successful are his plays *Brekhnia* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* staged in Germany, Italy, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Norway, and elsewhere in the first half of the 1920s.

Along with that, I emphasize his increasing uprootedness during 1920-25. As a result, Vynnychenko becomes more preoccupied with a broad range of international problems—a utopian vision of a future egalitarian society, criticism of capitalism's technical progress, dehumanization, pacifism, simpler ways of life, and racial tolerance. Displaced from his native country and not rooted firmly in any other country, he finds himself in almost nomadic predisposition as that of "citizen of the world." His homeland, however, remains important as a part of this universal picture.

Among the special characteristics of displacement that distinguish Vynnychenko from many other displaced writers is his membership in a colonized community. The writer addresses this problem during both periods. Despite a brief period of independence in 1917-20, Ukraine remained for European discourse a *terra incognita* or simply a

Russian territory. To be a displaced writer from a "non-historic" nation appears to be quite a different proposition than being a displaced writer from an "historic" nation. "Can the subaltern speak?" (Spivak)—remains an important question in this study. Applying a postcolonial perspective on the earlier period, when Ukraine was seen as a colonized entity, I seek to reveal how Vynnychenko confronts his colonized status and struggles to represent national identity and carry out a kind of a mission for his country. In particular, I shall speak in terms of cultural colonialism, with its division between the "West and the rest" (Said 1993, 51). As the major characteristic of this colonial subjugation, I see the transformation of the colonized by the colonizer as the space of exoticism (usually represented in ethnographic terms) and hence recognized as being aesthetically of minor value.

My study proposes a comparative reader-response analysis of Vynnychenko's utopian novel *Soniachna mashyna*. Having achieved a huge success in Ukraine, it failed to draw the attention of European publishers, even though the author wanted to make it into a "calling card" of Ukrainian literature in the West. The paradox acquires greater salience if one takes into account the success of his earlier plays, written during the first period (e.g. *Brekhnia* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*).

Geographical displacement, especially when it is forced, considerably influences the outlook of displaced persons. It can bring on an existential crisis (as in the case of Stephan Zweig) or a cardinal reevaluation of one's life either on the individual level or with respect to one's homeland or the world at large (e.g., Thomas Mann and Nabokov). Vynnychenko, with his active political involvement and intensive philosophical quest during his displacement, represents a unique case. In many respects, Vynnychenko the writer was being reformed outside his country. While he already had some modernist and Marxist views in the homeland owing to the common European context, his other views were the result of his stay abroad—equilibrium, utopianism, internationalism, which I shall address below.

Vynnychenko's firm and persistent Marxist stance is a very important characteristic of his displacement. It distinguishes him from many other displaced writers, who in many cases turn to a criticism of communist ideology (e.g., Zamyatin, Koestler, and Gombrowicz). No doubt, Vynnychenko's Marxist views in many respects determine his "anti-Western" rhetoric, his broad international preoccupation, and even his utilitarianism. Although his criticism of capitalism in the 1920s reflects similar tendencies in Western intellectual thought, his vision of a future society as an ideal, harmonious world remains quite dogmatic and is reflected in *Soniachna mashyna*.

Utopianism is another important aspect of Vynnychenko's displacement. Traditionally, it is approached from political and ideological perspectives. Without disagreeing with this, my project proposes to view utopianism also as a result of geographical displacement and as a kind of psychological dividedness. Vynnychenko's utopian novel *Soniachna mashyna* serves as a good example of his ambiguous displaced condition. Being uprooted from his homeland by his fellow communists and rejecting the bourgeois values of the "declining West," he finds his way into the utopian country of "nowhere." Certainly, this does not negate an aesthetical and ideological reading of the book. From the psychological point of view his shift to utopian thinking may be also explained by his nostalgia for the future, which, along with the more common nostalgia for the past, reveals his state of alienation from the present.

As a hypothesis, I suggest that Vynnychenko's displacement influenced his literary development and formal experimentations. Although as a politically engaged writer he was largely preoccupied with themes and ideas, as a major modernist he also exploited elements of symbolism (*Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*), folklore and adventure narratives ("Olaf Stefenzon," *Soniachna mashyna*) and Expressionism (*Soniachna mashyna*). The latter was obviously an impact of Weimar Germany, his new hostland. At the same time Vynnychenko's imaginary return to his childhood (in the form of his children stories) were marked by strong features of realism. The relationship between geographical displacement and literary style is a poorly explored issue and would require further study, particularly in comparative terms.

CHAPTER TWO

FIRST DISPLACEMENT, 1907-1914

Vynnychenko's first displacement can be considered the most informative for understanding the formation of Vynnychenko-the-writer. During this period his mind is focused mainly on the homeland; his writings as well include themes, settings, characters and problems from there. Although he enjoys his travels throughout Europe in the tradition of a modernist writer, he also experiences the predicament of his forceful exile, during which, however, he becomes the most popular and influential writer in the Ukrainian literary process. The year 1907 signifies a crucial turn in his literary career from realistic short stories about lower-class peasantry and workers to moral and philosophical plays and novels about the intelligentsia, with emphasis changing from social observations to modernist experiments and a struggle of ideas. In this chapter I will examine how the displaced condition influenced Vynnychenko's writings during 1907-14. Specifically, starting from a general overview of displacement as an important attribute of Modernism, I discuss Vynnychenko as displaced modernist writer and his relationship with the homeland and the hostland.

2.1. Displacement and the Modernist Experience

2.1.1. Creativity and Travel in Perspective

Movement in space is intrinsically connected with the dialectics of the 'same' and the 'other,' of external and internal change. Difference is a basis for new experience. Travel, thus, can be treated as an important form of approaching the other, it leads to new knowledge, change and new vision of the world and life. "[M]ovement in space is the first sign, the easiest sign, of change… Narrative is also nourished by change; in this sense journey and narrative implies one another," writes Tzvetan Todorov (287). Moreover, physical travel often predates inner travel. That is why, probably, Somerset Maugham says that one must live in a minimum of three countries in order to begin to understand one's own (Gurr, 25). "To be out of the country about which one is writing seems to be a vital prerequisite" (ibid., 17). This geographical distance, according to Gurr, creates "the pose of detachment" (145), which may help writers in redefining their identity and elaborating new attitude towards the homeland, hostland and world. It was, for instance, the most suitable way for Vynnychenko's compatriot, Gogol, to contemplate and vivisect Russia from his Italian expatriation. He confesses: "…about Russia I can only write in Rome. Only there is it present to me in its entirety, in all its immensity" (qt. in Ely, 98).

But do we necessarily need to travel to better explore the world and ourselves? There is always a tendency to emphasize the inner or spiritual journey, practiced largely by religious persons and mystics, which echoes our discussion about inner and outer exile in Chapter One (cf. 17-18). Lieh Tzu, a Taoist author (IV BC), said:

> Those who take great pains for exterior journeys do not know how to organize visits that one can make inside oneself. He who journeys outside is dependent on exterior things; he who makes interior visits can find in himself everything he needs. This is the highest way to travel; while the journey of the one who depends on exterior things is a poor journey (qt. in Todorov, 290).

On the other hand, there are always those who substantiate travel as a necessary prerequisite for self-observation and self-development. As an ancient Arab aphorism says: "If the water of a pond remains still, it becomes stagnant, muddy, and fetid; it only remains clear if it moves and runs. The same is true of the man who travels" (ibid., 291). According to Montaigne, "[T]his great world… is the mirror in which we must look in order to recognize oneselves from the proper angle;" contact with others, he says, helps "to rub and polish our brain" (ibid., 291).

There always must be a balance between the self and the other and between sameness and change to maintain smooth continuity:

> …the *I* does not exist without a *you*. One cannot reach the bottom of oneself if one excludes others. The same holds true for knowledge of foreign countries and different cultures: the person who knows only his own home always runs the risk of confusing culture and nature, of making custom the norm, and of forming generalizations based on a single example: oneself (ibid., 292).

Within the historical context scholars define different kinds of travel: pilgrimage, "grand Tour," philosophical, circumnavigation, travel for travel's sake, political, and scientific, etc. The overall sense of pilgrimage, either religious or secular, is to bring inner renewal, spiritual refreshment and purification:

> Pilgrims are persons in motion—passing through territories not their own—seeking something we might call completion… We [are] creatures perpetually searching for passages that promise approach to another shore—a shore that will complete us… These physical passings through apertures can print themselves deeply into us, not in our physical senses alone but in our spiritual sense as well, so that what we apprehend outwardly becomes part of the lasting geography of our souls (Niebuhr, 7; 10).

Dalby Clift and Wallace B. Clift tie pilgrimage closely with travel. Among the reasons for pilgrimages, they name the following: curiosity, to get outside the normal routine of life, to reclaim lost or abandoned or forgotten parts of oneself, to admire something beautiful, to make a vacation more interesting and to prepare for death (61). In this respect, European cities were real cultural Meccas for writers all over the world. Malcolm Cowley, for instance, describes travel of American expatriate writers to Europe as a pilgrimage to a Holy Land.

Historically, migrant literary experiences of modern times, starting from the late eighteenth century to the nineteenth century, was considered to be a leading force in the development of European letters. Not surprisingly, the Danish critic George Brandes (1842-1927) started his six volume work, *Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature*, from 'emigrant' literature. Speaking specifically about French émigré writers (i.e., Chateaubriand, Rousseau, Werther, René, Obermann, Nodier, Madame de Staël, and Barante) and their impact on European literary process, he indicates:

> To me the emigrant literature seemed the natural starting-point indicated by history itself. Looked at from one point of view, this group prepares the way for the religious and political reaction in French literature; looked at from another, it prepares the way for the Romantic school in France... In a word, the emigrant literature constitutes the prologue to the great literary drama of the century (198).

Brandes, however, did not distinguish the nature of 'emigrant' experience as something specific, nor what made émigré writers a leading force in the development of letters.

The period of *fin de siecle* was especially marked by (e)migrant experience of writers. This is largely explained by the enormous development of the capitalist production, new technologies, communications and urbanization. During 1890s and 1900s major technological innovations considerably expanded the international movement and communication (the internal combustine engine, the diesel engine, the steam turbine, electricity, oil and petroleum as the new sources of power, the automobile, tho motor bus, the tractor, the aeroplane, the telephone, the typewriter, and the tape machine) (Bullock, 59):

> The chance of casual international encounter… was greatly increased, and with it the rapidity with which ideas and opinions were exchanged across national frontiers. A chart of the movements of artists, writers and thinkers in time and space during these years would doubtless reveal an astonishing incidence of random encounter… to create that spread of internationalism which… is the main merit and sign of Modernism. Translations proliferated, and this was accompanied by a marked improvement in their general quality, and a quickening of the speed with which they tended to follow the original publication (McFarlane, 78).

Displacement in space is considered an important characteristic of modernist experience (Bradbury, 96; White, 5). For many artists to be truly creative means to be displaced and extraterritorial. Many writers felt alienated and preferred a stance of detachment that gave them the possibility of observing society as if from the sidelines. The powers of distance, which cultivate detachment, are characterized by uncertainty and ambivalence and bring "methods of objectivity" (Amanda Anderson). Detached writers, in Anderson's opinion, could thoughtfully address the challenging moral questions. External and internal displacement became a wide-spread mode of writer's response to their alienation and a form of their detachment. It facilitated their highly individualistic and aesthetic self-consciousness. Many a modernist writer was an expatriate from his/her homeland (to cite the most obvious examples: James Joyce, Thomas Eliot, Ezra Pound, Ernest Hemingway, Sinclair Lewis and William Faulkner). Joyce, for instance, claimed that "no one who has any self-respect stays in Ireland" (171). American expatriates voluntary fled from the extreme puritanicalness and commercialism of their society into "new prairies of the mind" of Europe (Cowley, 79). Many expatriates were not isolated exiles but hedonistic travelers thanks in part to the development of new means of fast transportation. Joyce lived in Triest, Zurich and Paris; Pound lived in England, France and Italy; Americans, while living in France, often traveled to other European countries (e.g., Italy, Greece, Spain, and Germany). They enjoyed their Bohemian way of life, a cult that originated in Paris from the middle of the nineteenth century as a revolt against conformity of bourgeois society.

Modernism created an atmosphere of international communication, concentrated mainly in big cities such as Paris, London, Berlin, Zurich, Prague, etc.

> In these culture-capitals, sometimes, but not always, the national political capitals, right across Europe, a fervent atmosphere of new thought and new arts developed, drawing in not only young native writers and would-be writers, but artists, literary voyagers, and exiles from other countries as well. In these cities, with their cafés, and cabarets, magazines, publishers, and galleries, the new aesthetics were distilled; generations argued and movements contested; the new causes and forms became matters of struggle and campaign (Bradbury, 96).

Here is how the French art critic, Louis Vauxcelles, eye-witnessed artistic life in Paris in 1912: "The 'Salon d'Automne' and the 'Indépendants' are full of Moldo-Walachians, Munichers, Slavs and Guatemalans... Sickened by the café-scene at home, they have landed here in hordes, crowding in a Matisse's studio…" (qt. in Cahm, 167). For Gertrude Stein, an indispensable force in the artistic lifeblood of Paris, the city was a home town and centre of the universe: "It was in Paris that the fashions were made… art and literature [were] part of it… Paris was the place that suited those of us that were to create the twentieth century art and literature… Naturally it was foreigners who did it" (11-13).

Modernism brought a new type of culture—mobile, individualistic, cosmopolitan, urban, contradictory and experimental. The artistic intelligentsia became an international caste claiming its leading role in the reformation of society. New aesthetic and philosophical ideas (i.e., Marxism, Darwinism, Nietzscheanism, Bergsonianism, and Freudianism) brooded intensively in minds of modernist writers, inspiring them toward experiments with both styles and themes. A displaced writer or writer-traveler became a significant receiver and carrier of these new modernist tendencies.

2.1.2. Europe and Ukrainian Modernism

The changes in all spheres of life that took place in Europe did not escape Ukraine either. Modernist ideas permeate Ukrainian cultural life and made a significant impact on its intellectual and artistic milieu. Among the characteristics of Ukrainian Modernism, critics distinguishe anti-populism, individualism, urbanism, socialism, feminism, aesthetism, intellectualism, social and national preoccupation and Europeanness.[1]

Anti-populism was a visible factor of modernist ideology, largely because the Ukrainian society, being colonized and marginalized in the Russian Empire, was quite conservative and its culture relied heavily on folk patterns and realistic writings with emphases on the idealization of peasants' life, schematic characters and didacticism. Among the most consistent supporters of isolationism and populism in Ukrainian literature was Ivan Nechui-Levyts'kyi (1838-1918), a leading realist. In his article

---

[1] Having been neglected for a long time, Modernism became a subject of special interest in Ukrainian literary studies. There were significant number of recent works and discussions on this matter, including *Populism and Modernism in Ukrainian Criticism: 1860-1920* (PhD Thesis, 1987) by Halyna Muchin, *Dyskurs ukrains'koho modernizmu* (1997) by Solomea Pavlychko, *Proiavlennia slova: dyskursiia rannioho ukrains'koho modernizmu (1997)* by Tamara Hundorova; Discussion on Ukrainian modernism included works by Danylo Struk ("The Journal "Svit": a Barometer of Modernism"), Oleh Ilnytzkyj ("The Modernist Ideology and Mykola Khvylovyi"), Maxim Tarnawsky ("Modernism in Ukrainian Prose"), and George Grabowicz ("Commentary: Exorcising Ukrainian Modernism").

"S'ohochasne literaturne priamuvannia" [Contemporary Literary Directions] (1878) he argued for three main principles in Ukrainian literature—reality, nationality, and ethnicity—which should limit writers and direct them toward a realistic style, traditional literary forms, and a relevant literary content based on the life of the Ukrainian people [narod], and, more narrowly, the peasantry [muzhyky]:

> If a writer feels a little bit himself a Ukrainian citizen and a part of the Ukrainian people and community, he must have a sacred obligation to render in his imagination and his heart that community, which groups around him, to share their joy and their sorrows, not to climb over to strange kitchen gardens and not to expose his soul to pictures of foreign non-Ukrainian life... We are told that the folk offers poor material for literature, that his individuality is little developed, that a poet does not find many different types and characters, that folk life is very spontaneous, and that peasants resemble each other like two small insects. Let it be so, but nonetheless Ukrainian people offer a lot of material for Ukrainian writers (1998a, 216).

During the debate about the emergence of Modernism in Ukrainian literature, Nechui-Levyts'kyi criticized it fiercely and lumped it with decadentism, symbolism, eroticism and even pornography. "...[O]ur people are very timid and neither like erotic stories nor know and have swear words in their vocabulary, except, probably, young factory workers who borrowed them from Russians [moskali] and from Russian villages..." (1998b, 234).

Not surprisingly, the modernist Lesia Ukrainka associated Nechui-Levyts'kyi with literary backwardness. Writing to Mykhailo Drahomanov, her uncle, she said: "For God's sake, don't judge us only through Nechui's novels, otherwise you have to condemn us, the innocent, forever. At least I don't know any intelligent character in Nechui's novels. All Ukraine must appear silly if one trusted him" (qt. in Kosach-Kryvyniuk, 156).

Serhii Iefremov (1876-1937), though much younger than Nechui-Levyts'kyi, was another rigorous adherent of traditionalism in Ukrainian literature and its role of social engagement. In his Russian-language article "V poiskakh novoi krasoty" [In a Search for New Beauty] (1902) he criticized four modernist writers, Ol'ha Kobylians'ka, Natalia Kobryns'ka, Katria Hrynevycheva and Hnat Khotkevych, for their "symbolism and decadentism," finding these roots in European influence. He did not find any use for new European trends—with their formalism, aesthetism and intellectualism—which detracted from the depiction of the social life of local people. In his comment about Kobylians'ka's works he wrote: "...Miss Kobylians'ka takes a big sin on her soul by creating harmful, anti-social and corrupted unsteady minds, a trend in literature that will have, and already has had, serious consequences" (120).

The orientation toward Europe by Ukrainian modernists helped break the isolationism and provincialism of the Realist school. Solomea Pavlychko in her recent ground-breaking monograph on Ukrainian Modernism, *Dyskurs modernizmu v ukrains'kii literaturi* [Discourse of Modernism in Ukrainian Literature] (1997), wrote:

> The perception of Western ideas, including ideas of modern Western philosophy and culture, was not simply a part of an abstract cultural experience but namely an issue of a cultural orientation for the intelligentsia which was self-conscious in the creation of its own culture.
>
> The concept of 'modernism' came from the European West and revealed a common state of modernity connected with the change of aesthetic orientation at the end of the century (42-43).

In this ideological encroachment of European Modernism one could see a form of mind travel, which stimulated more openness to the "other" and created a desire to travel and see the world. This led to a kind of intellectual displacement in society that was reflected in discussions about new literary directions. The young modernist writers were well-educated. Lesia Ukrainka, for instance, knew several languages and translated from Russian, Polish, German, French, English, Italian and Old Greek. As early as in 1891, the twenty-year old Lesia Ukrainka, in her letter to Drahomanov writes from Vienna about Europeanness as a current tendency among the new generation of Ukrainian writers:

> Our young people are now oriented toward the West. Thus, many of them are studying French, German, English, and Italian in order to be able to read foreign literature. I hope that if Ukrainians know more foreign literature, then maybe the strange dilettantism that is prevalent today will disappear from ours (1975, 10: 85).

Modernist ideas permeated the Ukrainian literary discourse in the late nineteenth century first in the works of writers from Western Ukraine which was part of Austro-Hungary at the time. Although modernist elements could be found already in writings of the realistic writer, Franko (he started his collection "Ziviale lystia" [Withered Leaves] in 1886 and published it in 1896), its first representative can be considered the female writer, Ol'ha Kobylians'ka. She was nourished by German literary tradition and even wrote her first works in German. Kobylians'ka was the first who introduced Nietzschean ideas into Ukrainian literature and elaborated extensively on an image of the strong emancipated women in her works such as *Liudyna* [A Human Being] (1894), *Tsarivna* [The Princess] (1896), and "Pryroda" [Nature] (1897). Writers from "Moloda Muza" [Young Muse] (i.e. Petro Karmans'kyi, Vasyl' Pachovs'kyi and Bohdan Lepkyi and other) established the first literary group which utilized modernist principles in their works.[2]

Modernist preoccupations in the Russian part of Ukraine emerged almost simultaneously. We saw how Lesia Ukrainka emphasized Ukrainian youth's interest in contemporary European writings, and her first modernist drama, *Blakytna troianda* [Blue Rose], was written in 1896. She wrote in her letter to Kobylians'ka that she too was familiar with Nietzschean ideas but they did not affect her with the phenomenon of the "blond superman" (Kosach-Kryvyniuk, 483). The first manifesto of Modernism appeared in the Russian part of Ukraine. It was published by Mykola Voronyi in the almanac *Z-nad khmar i dolyn* [From Above the Clouds and Valleys] (Odesa, 1903), in which he stated that "our intellectual no longer wants to read our literature and our poets. His aesthetic taste, nourished by the best European literary works (even if they are in Russian translations) and by Russian literature, feels only aversion to Ukrainian ones" (Pavlychko, 99). Critics affiliated with the journal *Ukrains'ka khata* [Ukrainian House] (1909-14) located in Kyiv (i.e., Mykola Ievshan, Mykola Sriblians'kyi (Mykyta Shapoval), Pavlo Bohats'kyi and Andrii Tovkachevs'kyi) also followed the modernist principles in art and were opposed to the traditional orientation of Ukrainian literature towards folk clichés and realistic narratives. Besides works of Ukrainian modernists, the journal, for instance, published literary and scholarly works by European writers such as Maurice Maeterlinck, Charles Baudelaire, Knut Hamsun, Heinrich Mann, Soren Kierkegaard, Peter Altenberg, to name but a few.

---

[2] In his article, "Moloda Muza" (*Dilo*, 1907, no. 249) which is also considered to be an unofficial manifesto of the group, Ostap Luts'kyi called their main objectives—criticism of utilitarianism and aesthetism. He did not object to social and patriotic motifs but they must be embodied in a good poetic form. Among the most influential writers Luts'kyi named Nietzsche, Ibsen, Maeterlinck and Baudelaire.

There was a 'fear/attraction' dichotomy concerning the encroachment of European Modernism into Ukrainian cultural space. For instance, Ivan Franko, a leading Ukrainian critic and writer demanded a critical attitude toward "the most recent Parisian fashion" and writers such as Nietzsche, Baudelaire, Verlaine, Maeterlinck, Ibsen and Arne Garborg (1976, 31: 35). His younger contemporary, Mykola Ievshan from *Ukrains'ka khata*, also warns against blind emulation of foreign patterns, proposing a thoughtful synthesis of various traditions: "…[T]he main thing is that, having close contacts with foreign literatures, we must not lose original features of our own and not force ourselves to put on foreign clothes, albeit very attractive, so as not to undermine our literature with elements of foreign literatures…" (1998a, 312). Ievshan's position and that of other members of *Ukrains'ka khata* reflected the tension between aesthetism and utilitarianism, which manifested itself in their criticism of futurist experiments by the young poet, Mykhail' Semenko. In their review of Semenko's book, *Derzannia* [Bravado] (1914), the critics, Ievshan (1998b) and Sriblians'kyi (1914), criticized the poet's destruction of language and rebuked his emulations of Russian Futurism.

Ukrainian Modernism, as many critics argue (Ilnytzkyj, Pavlychko, Hundorova), was not purely an aesthetic phenomenon. Ilnytzkyj, for instance, points to how Modernism included also social themes [hromads'ka tema] (1991, 261). As the poet Voronyi wrote: "My friend, I like beauty like my native Ukraine." Ilnytzkyj argues that the modernists recast Ukrainian culture in their own elitist image and saw the defense of this new high culture as their highest social mission. Ukrainian Modernism thus undermined the role of Russian culture in Ukrainian society and turned Ukrainian populist literature into a form of low brow culture. We shall see how this tension between aesthetism and social and national preoccupation works in Vynnychenko's writings.

2.1.3. Ukrainian Writers in Europe

With the intellectual roots of European Modernism sketched in, we can now focus on how the physical aspects of displacement influenced Ukrainian artists and writers. In examining this question, I noted that most, if not all, modernist writers were travelers, expatriates, or exiles, who were exposed to new possibilities of international contacts. Franko named communication a 'sign of the epoch,' which led to new tendencies and the "internationalization of literary tastes and interests." Among the characteristics of this process, he names the

> break of old geographic, state, and ethnic borders, the enormous development of communication, limitless expansion of literary horizons, common ideas and ideals in the writing of one generation in different countries, similarity of literary taste in some social strata of different nations, the dominance of certain traditions and literary fashions throughout the entire civilized world of our time (1976, 31: 33).

There were different causes for displacement—educational, artistic, medical, political, or simply tourism. Lesia Ukrainka, for instance, traveled a lot for medical reasons (e.g., Italy, Austria, Egypt, the Crimea, and the Caucasus). After arriving in Vienna, her first impression was that she had entered a different world:

> Sitting here ...I look around at this Europe and Europeans; certainly, sitting here on the sidelines, you cannot see everything, but you can still see something. My first impression was as if I had arrived in some sort of different world—a better world, a freer one...

> Then that bright impression became somewhat less so, but from the very beginning this contrast between our life and the life here almost dazzled me (Letter to Mykhailo Drahomanov from 17 March 1891, 1975, 10: 83, 85).

She observes this new, more cosmopolitan way of life, attends the theatre, has meetings in cafes and generally has more opportunities for socializing:

> Then in the evening, when we go to the theatre or stay at home, or go to a café… to the so-called Schember, there is always someone from among the 'Ruthenians' sitting there, there is always a group of Serbs playing billiards, and there are also Germans and all sorts of people of other nationalities. That café is interesting because it has various Slavic newspapers, Galician populist and Moscophile, Polish, Czech, Serbian, Croatian, Bulgarian, and all sorts of other newspapers. People here… write notes, conduct debates, they even write 'appeals,' in general, here they feel more 'at home' than at home. Finally, as I have already mentioned, people here live more on the street than at home, and it would be strange for them to imagine staying all day at home and not go anywhere (Letter to Mykhailo Kosach from 25 February 1891, ibid., 74-75).

More interesting, however, is the fact that she realizes that her vision of her homeland has changed during this encounter with Europe. This causes a cultural rift in her perception of the homeland, which has to be mended, and psychological trauma, which has to be healed:

> As soon as we arrived and saw how people were living here, I understood Galician life and relations better. After comparing what seemed to me to be useful, good, and necessary in Ukraine to the local life, these same things seemed so miserable, stupid, useless, or even harmful. The problem is that most of our Ukrainian community only reads the wretched Russian press and because of that it does not see the world as it should—not what is at the window nor what is beyond the window.
>
> Now it will be even more difficult for me in my homeland than before. I'm ashamed that we are so unfree, that we wear shackles, and sleep peacefully under them. So, I have awakened and it is difficult, pitiful and painful (Letter to Mykhailo Drahomanov from 17 March 1891, ibid., 83, 85).

Lesia Ukrainka's temporary geographical displacement contributed to an inner displacement in her native society. The main protagonist of her works is typically an alienated and lonely neo-romantic hero who challenges human, social, and moral corruption on the way to individual and national freedom. This encounter often ends in death (e.g., Antaeus in *Orhiia* [Orgy] and Liubov in *Blakytna troianda* [Blue Rose]). Interestingly, all her dramatic poems but one, *Blakytna troianda*, have a foreign setting: ancient Greece (*Orhiia*), the ancient Jewish world (*Na poli krovi* [On the Field of Blood]), ancient Rome (*Rufin i Prystsila* [Rufin and Priscilla], *V katakombakh* [In the Catacombs]), pioneer America (*V pushchi* [In the Wilderness]), and old Muscovy (*Boiarynia* [The Boiar Woman]). Her contemporaries criticized the writer for this "escape" from the homeland, although the main ideas of her works—aspirations to freedom, dignity of the self, the denunciation of moral hypocrisy and the undermining of colonial discourse—were a response to her struggling society:

> Gradually, a clear-cut turning point occurs in her writing: that strong and powerful voice of the poet-citizen sounds more and more quiet, and Lesia Ukrainka more often escapes deep into past ages, as though to find there a refuge or shelter from bitter reality and to weaken the feeling of her own loneliness ... The exotic settings of her last works helped her to abstract images from modern reality and helped to express her thoughts in their pure, unobscured form (Iefremov 1919, 2: 526-27).

Inner displacement, thus, gave her an important modernist stance of distance and detachment, and the possibilities to transcend everyday life by focusing more on the world of ideas.

In a letter to Kotsiubyns'kyi, Mykola Voronyi, who lived in Vienna and studied in L'viv, also writes about the spirit of freedom in Europe: "After the Russian stench and hopeless boring 'everyday routine,' I breathe much more freely here, and if it continues like this (eight months have already passed since I left my 'beloved homeland'), it is possible that I'll settle here for good" (Maznyi, 1: 153).

Kotsiubyns'kyi was a prominent modernist writer who, like Vynnychenko, started with realistic stories ("Ialynka" [The Christmas-Tree], "Tsipoviaz" [The Flail-Maker], and "Piatyzlotnyk" [The Five Zloty Coin]) but later developed his impressionistic technique through deep psychological explorations of life's ambiguities ("Tsvit iabluni" [The Apple-Tree Blossom], "Lialechka" [Dolly], and "Intermezzo," etc). Kotsiubyns'kyi also traveled a lot and created beautiful sketches about Moldova ("Dlia zahal'noho dobra" [For the General Good], "Pe-koptior" [a Moldovan phrase meaning 'To the Oven'] and "Vid'ma" [Witch]); the Crimea ("Na kameni" [On the Rock], "Pid minaretamy" [Beneath the Minarets], and "V putakh shaitana" [In the Devil's Chains]); and Italy ("Khvala zhyttiu" [Glory to Life] and "Na ostrovi" [On the Island]). Whereas he would travel to Moldova and the Crimea on business, he traveled to Capri for medical reasons. This Italian island was his favourite place and he visited there several times, encountering Gorky and other writers. On Capri Kotsiubyns'kyi wrote a number of works ("Lyst" [The Letter], "Koni ne vynni" [The Horses Are Not to Blame] and "Podarunok na imenyny" [The Birthday Present]). Interestingly, Kotsiubyns'kyi met Vynnychenko for the first time "abroad," i.e., in L'viv (then part of Austro-Hungary). "I saw Kotsiubyns'kyi here, and I liked him very much," Vynnychenko writes to Chykalenko (4 June 1909).[3] Their next meeting took place again in L'viv a year later (22 December

---

[3] All Vynnychenko's letters to Chykalenko come from one archival source and will be cited with the date of writing.

1910).[4] Neither Kotsiubyns'kyi nor Lesia Ukrainka ever visited the two large centres of the Russian Empire, Moscow and Saint-Petersburg, to which members of the Ukrainian intelligentsia gravitated during the nineteenth century (e.g., Gogol, Taras Shevchenko, and Panteleimon Kulish, to name a few).

It was much easier for writers and artists from Western Ukraine to travel. Vasyl' Stefanyk, who wrote almost exclusively about the Galician peasantry, studied in Krakow at the Jagiellonian University. Instead of pursuing medicine, he fell in love with literature after immersing himself in the Bohemian atmosphere of Polish Modernism and establishing close relationships with the writers of "Young Poland." Bohdan Lepkyi and Ostap Luts'kyi, members of "Moloda muza," also studied in Krakow. Petro Karmans'kyi studied at the Vatican (1900-1904), traveled to Canada in 1913, and later to Vienna, Rome, and Brazil. Karmans'kyi offered two explanations for his stay in the Vatican: his difficult material situation and his desire to learn more about ancient Italian culture. It is thus a mistake to consider this trip one of "the most tragic of Karmans'kyi's mistakes," as S. Shakhovs'kyi has written. I agree with the critic Mykola Il'nyts'kyi, who refuted Shakhovs'kyi's approach: "Isn't it natural for a young man to want to travel and crave to see the world!" (5). Karmans'kyi's attitude toward travel can be traced in his novel *Kiltsia rozhi* [Rings of the Rose].[5] The novel portrays Ukrainian artistic expatriates in Rome and contains numerous references to the city's history and contemporary realities. The main protagonist, Petrovych, Karmans'kyi's alter-ego, expresses his dissatisfaction with the cultural milieu in the homeland, which spurs him to flee to Europe. Petrovych is willing to "go abroad every year" because it "enriches his spirit, refreshes him, and prevents him from despising his own society to the end. Abroad, he writes his best poetry, whereas life among his own people saps his creative powers and condemns him to sterile boredom" (*Suchasnist'* 4: 22-23).[6]

---

[4] For more details see *Kapriis'ki siuzhety: "italiis'ka" proza Mykhaila Kotsiubyns'koho i Volodymyra Vynnychenka*. Uporiadnyk Volodymyr Panchenko. Kyiv: Fakt, 2003. [Capri: Experiments and Experimenters].

[5] It was completed in 1921 and published in *Suchasnist'* 3 (1989): 17-25, 4: 2-27.

Les' Kurbas, the founder of the modernist Ukrainian theatre, began his career in Vienna where he studied philology and theosophy at the Department of Philosophy (1907-08). Among his readings were works by George Brandes, Henri Bergson and especially Rudolph Steiner, "an idol of European students." Much of the time Kurbas attended theatre performances in Vienna, watching plays by Shakespeare (e.g., *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, and *King Lear*) and Ibsen (e.g., *Nora*) (Korniienko, Makaryk).

The most famous Ukrainian artist of the time was almost certainly the sculptor Alexander Archipenko. He arrived in Paris in 1908 (the same year as Vynnychenko) and soon established himself as one of the most innovative and influential sculptors of the day. He was an active participant of Parisian and European artistic life, exhibiting his works in France, Holland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, and the US. Among the artists with whom he forged close relationships were Fernand Léger, Guillaume Apollinaire, Amedeo Modigliani, and Constantin Brancusi.

Certainly, we have to take into account the difference between the older generation, represented by Nechui-Levyts'kyi, and the young modernists, but the latter's expatriation and openness to the world and new ideas can be seen as an important factor in their development. Expatriation and travel constitute a significant part of the modernist discourse that contributes to modernist writing, especially the undermining of tradition and encouragement of new ideas and critical reflections on society. Writers who are expatriates or travelers play an important and vital role in bridging the self and the other, one's own culture and the culture of other nations. Without these envoys, their native culture would have been more limited and would have developed at a much slower pace. Without these adventurers, the international world of art would have lacked a competitive spirit of quest and experimentation.

---

[6] For more details on Karmans'kyi's novel and his relationship with Italy, see Ilnytzkyj, Oleh. "Italy in the Works of Petro Karmansky." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*. 27, nos. 1-2 (Summer-Winter 2002): 79-91.

2.2. Vynnychenko as a Displaced European Modernist Writer

Without a doubt Vynnychenko fits this paradigm of the displaced European writer, although in some ways his displacement is different from, say, that of Lesia Ukrainka or Kotsiubyns'kyi. Vynnychenko's is largely defined by his specific ideological preoccupation and the nature of his displacement: involuntary exile. Here I am going to touch on Vynnychenko's Modernism in general, but will focus mainly on those attributes pertinent to displacement. Two aspects may be identified: 1) ideological; and 2) physical. The ideological aspect embraces the artistic and philosophical ideas (e.g., Nietzscheanism, Bergsonism, Marxism, and the works of modernist writers) that influenced Vynnychenko's writings. The physical aspect implies presence in the hostland, which leads to travel, communication with people, education, and intellectual growth, and also provides a sense of individual freedom.

Vynnychenko, like other Ukrainian modernist writers (e.g., Kotsiubyns'kyi and Lesia Ukrainka) grew up on traditional Ukrainian literature with its folk elements and social engagement (his first works, the poem "Poviia"[7] [The Prostitute] and the story "Narodnyi diiach" [The People's Activist], 1901, were written in this vein but published later). However, in his first published work, the story "Krasa i syla" [Beauty and Strength] (1902), he announced his departure from traditional realistic narrative and proclaimed his interest in modernist ideas. The story depicts two criminals, Il'ko and Andrii, who symbolize beauty and strength for Motria, a woman they both love. Many see Vynnychenko as a "transitional" writer, who combined and transformed realistic tradition into a modernist one. Mykola Zhulyns'kyi, for example, says:

> Vynnychenko the writer is a distiguished figure, who synthesized the essential characteristics of the transitional period—from critical realism to modernism. He was destined through his writings to build an ideological and aesthetic 'bridge' to new Ukrainian literature stimulated by European art and to create an original artistic world (1993, 485).

Like other Ukrainian modernist writers, Vynnychenko never entirely broke with "engaged" literature. At the same time he always expressed an interest in the formal aspects of his writing and especially in new themes. Often provocative and innovative, his themes—such as morality, love, family, art, biological instincts, and philosophy of life—served as the best indicators of his modernist preoccupation.

For a better understanding of this "dual side" in Vynnychenko's works, we have to address his interest in Marxism, an ideology that exerted a lifelong, powerful influence on the Ukrainian writer. This can be explained by his active political stance aimed at the radical transformation of the current social and political system of capitalist society, including the Russian Empire. Vynnychenko, who was one of the leaders of the

---

[7] This is the only poetic work by Vynnychenko in which he emulates patterns from works of such nineteenth-century writers as Taras Shevchenko and Panas Myrnyi. He refused to publish this apprentice work until the Ukrainian Academy of Science published it in 1929.

Ukrainian Social-Democratic Workers' Party, to a great extent defined the intellectual orientation of this party.[8]

During the *fin-de-siecle* period Marxism was considered a real modernist force helping to undermine traditional bourgeois values. Support for Marxist and socialist ideas was very strong among the intelligentsia and bohemians in Europe (e.g., Wilde, Joyce, and American expatriates). Here is how Cowley describes the harmony of these two trends: "[T]he two currents were hard to distinguish. Bohemians read Marx and all the radicals had a touch of the bohemian: it seemed that both types were fighting in the same cause. Socialism, free love, anarchism, syndicalism, free verse—all these creeds were lumped together by the public" (66). For Vynnychenko, living in the Russian imperial context, Marxism meant total liberation—social, national, and individual—and the creation of an egalitarian society. At the same time, Marxism as an "absolute narrative" tended to impose its own ideological paradigm, whose main essence was "engaged literature." This Marxist dichotomy was revealed in Vynnychenko's article, "Sposterezhennia neprofesionala. Marksyzm i mystetstvo" (1913). On the one hand, the writer recognized the progressive qualities of Marxism, which is a "new world… with a new way of reacting to life" [новий світ... з новим способом реагування на життя] (426). The creative force of Marxism was an important feature, which equated it with Modernism in art: "Marxism is above all movement. Movement without breaks and rests, creative and destructive" [I перш усього—марксизм є рух. Рух без перерви, без спочинку, творчий ї руйнуючий] (427). On the other hand, Vynnychenko ascribed these progressive qualities exclusively to Marxists. Following Marx's principle of history as a "class struggle," he pointed out that fervent Marxists must ignore universal values and recognize only class values, as they reflect this historical struggle of classes. In his radical Manichaean approach he disregards tradition, which he associates with bourgeois culture that "has become a thing of the past... it is already decaying and poisoning life with putrid vapours..." [оджило своє... вже гниє і гнійними випарами отруює життя...] (429). Hence, the writer was critical of pure aestheticism, excessive self-reflection, and formal experimentations without clear ideas. He speaks ironically of those who like to complain, "wrap themselves in a disguise of silly self-esteem," be fond of loneliness and "paint their garments in romantic, demonic, satanic, and 'symbolist' colours…" [фарбують свої рядення в романтичні, демонічні, сатаністичні, "символістичні" кольори...] (428). For a true Marxist "…[T]his feature is only worth pity and disgust…" [...[Д]ля марксиста ся риса гідна тільки жалю та огиди...] (428). In practice, however, he made pragmatic use of these "symbolist colours" if they corresponded well to his ideas (e.g., *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*).[9] Significantly, the optimistic tone of his thought was expressed at the end of Vynnychenko's first displacement, in 1913, when his main heroes, Khoma (*Rivnovaha*) and Stel'mashenko (*Po-svii, Bozhky*) were already broken down and tired of being lonely. In "Sposterezhennia neprofesionala," Vynnychenko reveals rather his rational ideological position, which competes with his subjective artistic commitment. The tension between these two poles was a specific feature of Vynnychenko's Modernism, which surfaced in a number of works (e.g., "Olaf Stefenzon"). Even though Marxism and socialism were still constructive and progressive forces in that they undermined bourgeois traditions and established modernist norms, in the writings of this period aesthetic principles ruled over ideology more often than not.

---

[8] In his memoirs Mykola Halahan describes Vynnychenko as a main proponent of a radical wing, 'l'action directe', whereas another leader of the party, Mykola Porsh, was more inclined toward the evolutionary way (122-23).

---

[9] In the 1920s Vynnychenko began using symbolist elements more extensively. In particular, he defined his novel *Soniachna mashyna* as a work of "symbolist realism."

Another philosophical trend that strongly influenced Vynnychenko during this period was Nietzscheanism.[10] Pavlo Khrystiuk focused special attention on this question in his article, "V. Vynnychenko and F. Nietzsche," which was published in 1913, when Vynnychenko was in exile. Traces of Nietzschean philosophy may be found in a number of works (e.g., *Shchabli zhyttia* [Ladders of Life] (1907), *Memento* [Memento] (1909), and *Chesnist' z soboiu*, etc) inasmuch as this strengthened a new type of revolutionary hero. The character of Myron Kupchenko in *Chesnist' z soboiu* most explicitly reflects this philosophical trend. Kupchenko's attachment to power is vividly expressed in the final paragraphs, where he and his new wife, Dara, contemplate the tragic events that had befallen the members of the Kysel's'kyi' family, including the death of Vira Kysel's'ka, all of them representatives of the old tradition and moral hypocrisy:

> Що ж? Сильне живе, слабе гине. Мертвих не воскресити. А деяких і воскрешати не треба... Е, чого там! От дивилась я на них. І горе їхнє якесь... трухляве. Жалувати їх навіть якось серйозно не можна... З трупів виходить життя? Все одно, нехай звідки хоче виходить, аби життя! Жити хочу! Жити, Мироне, робити, творити й руйнувать. Правда? Годі. Трупів не воскресить. Помогай живущим (267-268).
>
> What of it? The strong live and the weak die. The dead can't be resurrected. And some of the dead shouldn't be resurrected… Well! I watched them. Even their grief is somehow…rotten. One cannot even seriously feel sorry for them… Does life come from corpses? Regardless of where it comes from, it must be life! I want to live! To live, Myron, to work, to create and to destroy. Right? Enough. Corpses cannot be resurrected. Help the living.

---

[10] Nietzscheanism in Vynnychenko's works is discussed in detail in Kaspryk, Andrew. *Volodymyr Vynnychenko's Nietzschean Revolutionary Hero*. PhD Thesis. U of Illinois at Chicago, 2000 (UMI Accession Number 9978618).

Vynnychenko's first novel, *Chesnist' z soboiu*, is one of his most controversial and scandalous works, reminiscent in this sense of the works of such modernist writers as Joyce, Wilde, et al. He started writing it in Ukrainian, but because of objections from Ukrainian critics and journal editors he was forced to complete the novel and publish it in Russian ("Zemlia," 1911). The real cause of this conflict was the writer's attempt to write on a variety of provocative modernist issues, like love and family relationships, sex, prostitution, for which Ukrainian society was not prepared.

Vynnychenko's admiration for Nietzsche inspired him to translate *Also Sprach Zarathustra.*[11] Khrystiuk assumed that the idea of "honesty with oneself" came from this poem (1913, 289). Vynnychenko's interest in Nietzsche was a sore spot with his critics (Chykalenko, Iefremov), as it justified a very individualistic stance that was not tolerated by proponents of realism and utilitarianism in literature, never mind Marxists. The Nietzschean idea of a strong individual became Vynnychenko's philosophical and moral imperative that percolated through many of his works. In the play *Memento* he depicts a new man, the painter Vasyl' Kryvenko, who struggles between paternal instinct and the moral principle of honesty with oneself. Eventually Kryvenko refuses to be a "slave of blind instinct" and chooses the principle of rationalism, in whose name he allows his new-born, unwanted child to catch cold from an open window and die.

Both male and female characters with a strong will figure in Vynnychenko's other works: Natalia Pavlivna (*Brekhnia*), Ryta and Snizhynka (*Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*), Khoma (*Rivnovaha*), Zabolot'ko (*Zapovit bat'kiv*) and Stel'mashenko (*Po-svii* and *Bozhky*). However, what made Vynnychenko's characters different from Nietzsche's was that the Ukrainian writer's individualism was never so extreme and became largely his own dilemma. As a true Marxist, he opposes individualism ("Sposterezhennia neprofesionala"), although as a modernist writer Vynnychenko always feels detachment and distance from society. In a letter to Chykalenko he writes: "I am not satisfied with individualism as a sociological category. I find it one-sided, similar to an opposite theory, which claims the dominance of 'we' over 'I'" (qt. in Krutikova, 79). Although Vynnychenko's heroes often articulate collectivist ideas, in reality they remain more often lonely and in conflict with their society. For instance, the main protagonist of the novel *Bozhky* and the writer's alter-ego, Vadym Stel'mashenko, is depicted as a person with the "armour of an anchoret who has a breach" (14) thus emphasizing the dominance of individualism. This type of strong but alienated individual will figure in Vynnychenko's later works: Max Stor (*Soniachna mashyna*), the prophet Amar (*Prorok*), and Yvonne Volven (*Leprozorii*), revealing to a large extent the writer's own tension between the collective and the individual.

---

[11] The manuscript was never published and remains in Vynnychenko's archive in Kyiv (Panchenko 1998).

The influence of the French philosopher Henry Bergson on European Modernism was also considerable. His concept of consciousness, the important role of intuition, and the stream of life was the main challenge to a mechanistic view of nature. Bergson's ideas appealed to Vynnychenko for their contradictions, mystery, and strangeness [chudnyi]. He wrote some notes concerning the works of the French philosopher in his diary: "Stream of impressions. Today a man = a. b. c. d. Tomorrow = b. a. d. e. f., etc. There is a different reaction to the same phenomenon today and tomorrow (Bergson)" (*Shchodennyk* 1: 121). Bergson's influence is especially evident in the stories "Moment" [A Moment] and "Promin' sontsia" [A Ray of the Sun]. In "Moment" (1907)

Vynnychenko depicts a chance meeting between a young woman and a young man, both supposedly revolutionaries, when they are illegally crossing the border. Their encounter represents a moment of happiness, for both of them are taken out of the stream of everyday life that is manifested through their mutual passion for each other and comparison with nature. The narrator emphasizes the natural way of life, opposing it to social conventions: "I like these small insects and birds, these small unconscious protestants against the hypocrisy of their elder brother—man" [Люблю цих кузьок, пташок, цих маленьких, несвідомих протестантів проти лицемір'я старшого брата свого—людини] (498). The narrator pretends that these small insects speak to him: "Here, look, we don't need to hide, we don't have illegitimate children, we don't have passports, moralities, "codes of punishments," we are just small, healthy, pure cynics" [На, дивись, нам не треба ховатись, у нас нема незаконнорожденних, у нас нема пашпортів, моралів, "уложеній о наказаніях", ми маленькі, здорові, чисті циніки] (498). The unnamed heroes' sudden desire for each other is a manifestation of intuition and the spontaneous stream of life. But rational principles are imposed on the human mind that restricts human behaviour. The narrator decides to remember this moment of spontaneous happiness, although the conflict between the natural and the social haunts him, as it haunts the characters in Vynnychenko's other works.

In "Promin' sontsia" (1912), the writer depicts two convicts, one short and the other tall, both of whom are condemned to death. On their way to the place of execution, the short man cries, protests, and becomes hysterical, while the tall man looks resigned but full of inner energy. He spots a sun beam and the blue sky. Attempting to flee, he is killed. Vynnychenko describes the different reactions of the soldiers and officers to the execution: Sydorkevych cannot reconcile himself to it but has to follow orders. Zabornyi faints, and the rest just avert their faces. The story reveals Vynnychenko's interest in human psychology and complexity and the variability of human behaviour.[12]

Dissatisfied with the backwardness of Ukrainian letters, Vynnychenko had great admiration for the works of European writers. In his dissertation Panchenko thoroughly examines Vynnychenko's writings in the European literary context of 1902-1920, citing numerous examples of his generic and typological ties with writers, such as Guy de Maupassant, Gabriele d'Annunzio, Henrik Ibsen, Emile Zola, Knut Hamsun, August Strindberg, Stanislaw Przybyszewski, Fedor Dostoyevsky, and Maxim Gorky. This critic compares the motif of a child homicide in Vynnychenko's works (*Memento*, *Po-svii* and *Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelia*) with one in Maupassant's story "The Confession" (1884) and d'Annunzio's novel *L'Innocente* (1892). Suicide appears as an argument in both Vynnychenko's play *Brekhnia* and Ibsen's play *The Wild Duck* (1884). *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* resembles Zola's novel *Painters*. "Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku" is an elaboration of Miguel de Cervantes's theme from *Don Quixote* (1605), in which Anselmo asks his friend Lothario to test the fidelity of his wife Camilla. Eventually, both fall in love and flee from Anselmo, an event that leads to an unhappy ending.

The works of the Pole Przybyszewski were quite popular among Ukrainian modernist writers. Lesia Ukrainka in her article "Zametki o noveiishei pol'skoi literature" [Notes on the New Polish Literature] (1900) called him a "champion" of Modernism, who preferred "feelings to mind" (1965, 131). Vynnychenko, revealing the modernist preoccupation with human feelings and instincts, devoted considerable attention to these questions in his writings ("Moment" and "Promin' sontsia"), although he sought to counterbalance them with reasoning (the influence of positivism and Marxist materialism). In 1911 Vynnychenko notes in his diary: "Przybyszewski has a mystery… There is no action [in his writings] but only the life of a soul… Przybyszewski reflects modern life. He has a sense of what a modern man must be" (*Shchodennyk* 1: 42). In tribute to the Polish writer, Vynnychenko gave lectures on his writings in L'viv and Paris.

---

[12] Interestingly, Kotsiubyns'kyi elaborated on the theme of the death penalty perceived through the eyes of a child in the story "Podarunok na imenyny" [The Birthday Present] written on Capri in the same year (1912) as Vynnychenko's "Promin' sontsia."

Especially popular in the Ukrainian literary discourse were Scandinavian writers, such as Strindberg, Hamsun, Ibsen, Bjornson, and Garborg. Commenting on Garborg's novel *Den bortkomne faderen* [The Fugitive Father], Vynnychenko calls him a "sincere, whole-hearted, really creative and truly suffering" writer (ibid., 145).

Obviously, Vynnychenko was a part of this contemporary modernist discourse, and, as Panchenko argues, it would be difficult to examine his works without noting his connections with European literary trends:

> Trying to 'open a window on Europe,' this writer [Vynnychenko] had an ongoing discussion with many predecessors and contemporaries, sensitively responding to changes of literary fashions and to aesthetic quests both in Western European and Russian literature. Vynnychenko, as a phenomenon of Ukrainian literature, cannot be studied without his numerous artistic interests and references that include the implementation and transformation of foreign experience, as well as polemics with it (http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p1.shtml#).

On the other hand, Vynnychenko's physical presence in Europe significantly extended and modified his modernist worldview and helped to develop his new vision of the homeland and hostland. Certainly, there was a pragmatic reason behind Vynnychenko's decision to leave his homeland for an indefinite period of time, as he was awaiting trial, after which he could have likely been exiled to Siberia—the route for many convicted revolutionaries.[13] Even if it was an attempt to evade impending imprisonment, the creative and gifted twenty-seven-year-old writer tried to transform the bitterness of exile into enjoyment of expatriation and travel, to broaden his world outlook and look at things from a different perspective. "Banishment and withdrawal lead to adventure, discovery, and eventual resolution," Edwards writes (20). Moreover, the life of Europe, exuberant with cultural events, attracted talented artists and intellectuals (the writer addressed this theme in the play *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and the story "Olaf Stefenzon," which I shall examine later).

Literary critics have tended to see Vynnychenko's displacement mainly in terms of hardship, of longing for the homeland. Their critiques are full of such expressions as "difficult emigration" (Doroshkevych, 219), "the emigrant's miserable existence" (Richyts'kyi, 11) or "emigrant rubbish heap" (Shabliovs'kyi, 48). Taking displacement as a more complex phenomenon, I will challenge this established approach and show Vynnychenko's displacement also as a positive phenomenon. Despite social hardships stemming from his encounter with a new, unfamiliar space, Vynnychenko, as a young man who aspires to become familiar with European culture and literature, enjoys and takes advantages of it. In a letter to Vynnychenko, dated 25 June 1908, Maxim Gorky expresses that atmosphere of high expectations in the exile milieu: "Life is so interesting, and every day brings more and more emotions and trepidations, and more and more sprouts of the shining human spirit" (2000, 257).

Vynnychenko was not really isolated during his displacement in 1907-1914. He traveled to numerous European regions and cities on a kind of pilgrimage, or "Grand Tour." Sources tell us that Vynnychenko stayed in a variety of places. The year 1907:

---

[13] In early 1907, the number of people in exile in Siberia stood at 75,963 (Panchenko 2003, 188).

Switzerland (Geneva); 1908: Switzerland (Geneva and Bière), Italy (Capri), France (Paris), Ukraine (Kyiv, Kharkiv); 1909: Switzerland (Zurich), L'viv (Ukrainian city in Austro-Hungary), Ukraine (a village near Fastiv, Kyiv, Romanivka), Russia (Essentuki, in the Caucasus), Paris; 1910: Paris, Germany (Kurbad), L'viv, Russia (Saint-Petersburg, Essentuki), Ukraine (a village near Fastiv, Kyiv, Kononivka); 1911: L'viv, Germany, Italy (Florence, Genoa, Sestri Levante, Cavi di Lavogna), Paris, Galicia, Bukovyna; 1912: Paris, Germany, Ukraine, L'viv; 1913: Paris, Galicia, Bukovyna (Hlyboka, Luka); 1914: Paris, Germany (Schwarzwald), Italy (Cavi di Lavogna), Warsaw, Ukraine (Rosalia Vynnychenko 1953, 12; Chykalenko 1931; "Lystuvannia"; Vynnychenko's letters to Chykalenko). In November 1907 he even planned to visit the USA to raise funds for the establishment of a publishing house (17 November 1907). As is known, visiting the New World—a "powerful symbol of modernity for many European writers who were drawn to it geographically and imaginatively" (Hallivell, 103)—was one of the travel routes of many displaced modernist writers, such as Lorca, Kafka, Joyce, and Musil, among others. Gorky also visited the USA in 1906, where he wrote a number of works (the novel *Mat'* [Mother], a collection of essays *V Amerike* [In America], and *Moi interviu* [My Interviews]).

After settling first in Geneva in late 1907, Vynnychenko found success among émigré circles. Here he was offered work in the Russian newspaper *Zagranichnaia gazeta* [Foreign Newspaper], among whose collaborators were Vladimir Lenin, Alexander Bogdanov, Maxim, Gorky, and Anatolii Lunacharskii (4 January 1907; 4 March 1908). Having been born in the steppe region, he felt tired in Geneva because of the gloomy weather: "I wrote earlier stories during sunny weather, which now happens very rarely here" [Попередні оповідання написані в ясну погоду, якої тут зараз дуже рідко] (27 February 1908). The poor climatic conditions encouraged him to leave for sunny Italy. The weather was generally an important factor that affected Vynnychenko's creativity and was manifested in his works.

In 1909-1912 Vynnychenko frequently visited L'viv, where he had well-established contacts with Galician socialists and intellectuals. He often stayed in Levko Iurkevych's home (Iurkevych, a USDWP member and its financial donor, had also an apartment in Geneva) where he could concentrate on his writings (Panchenko 2003). L'viv was the largest Ukrainian cultural centre in the region, where the paths of Russian and Austrian Ukrainians crossed. As for its significance for local culture, L'viv can be compared with such European centres as Paris, London, Berlin, Vienna, Zurich, and Krakow. As mentioned earlier, the modernist writers' group "Moloda Muza" was founded in the city in 1906 as an analogue to similar groups in other countries (e.g., "Young Poland" and "Young Belgium," etc). Poor but artistically gifted, they crowded in cafés where a new modernist culture was being created, inspiring utilitarian and conservative society with more aesthetic consciousness. Here is how one of the group's leaders, Petro Karmans'kyi, in his book, *Ukrains'ka Bohema* [Ukrainian Bohemia], describes its activity:

> A café, modern, not expensive, quiet and cozy, remained the only place for our poor fellow poet or publicist, who, like a fish in water, needs extensive and intelligent company where he can find a source for his creative inspirations and ideas. This is the most money-saving institution ever achieved by modern urban civilization. Here a poor Ukrainian artist, who usually lives in the worst hole, without electricity, air, and heating in winter, could find comfort in the pre-war period: comfortable seats, heat, sufficient light, lots of newspapers and journals in several languages, dictionaries, and other reference materials, and sooner or later interesting company, intelligent

> conversation and enjoyment, and a brief respite from sombre reality—and all this for a few *sotyky*[14] that he paid for a tea or coffee. For that price he could feel like a genuine person and enjoy the possibility of working intellectually for hours (118-19).

It was L'viv where Vynnychenko brought his Russian-speaking wife to master the Ukrainian language. Here he wrote many of his works, including his first novel *Chesnist' z soboiu* (1910; published in 1911).

Paris was a centre that attracted students from Ukraine and other parts of the Russian Empire. One of them was his future wife, Rosalia Lifshyts'. Later, after their return to Ukraine, they would recollect those days in Europe as one of the most wonderful episodes in their life, a place to which they would like to return once more. The most impressive example is his diary notes dated 19 July 1917, in which he recollects the cities he had visited and dreamed of seeing them again:

> Солодкий сум ніжною колючкою поболює в серці: згадується Париж.—любий, затишний, добродушно-брудний, трошки нахабний, просторий, з запахом кухонь і веселими, кокетливими фартушками грезеток...
>
> Ось уже тепер я з невимовною ніжністю згадую тихі, прекрасні часи перебування в Італії, Парижі, Швайцарії...
>
> А Бретань? Чого я згадую її з таким солодким болем, з такою жагучою тугою? Чого люблю ті дні так глибоко, і радісно, і ясно? Через Коху?
>
> Коли кінчиться війна, коли трохи очуняє бідна Европа, ми з Кохою поїдемо в Каві, в Авон і в Бретань. Ми об'їдемо й обійдемо всі місця, що викликають цю соняшну, цю радісну, любови повну тугу в мені (1: 269-272).

> Sweet sadness like a gentle sting aches in my heart: I recollect Paris—nice, calm, genteelly grubby, a little bit impudent, spacious, with the smell of kitchens, merry and coquettish aprons...
>
> And now with great pleasure I recollect that quiet and wonderful time of my stay in Italy, Paris, Switzerland...

---

[14] A monetary unit equal to cents.

> And Brittainy. Why do I recollect it with such sweet pain and such deep longing? Why do I like those days so deeply, merrily, and brightly? Because of Kokha?[15]
>
> When the war is over and when poor Europe gets well a little, Kokha and I will go to Cavi [Cavi di Lavogna], Avon, and Brittainy. We shall visit and walk around all those places that engender this sunny, glad, and yearning, full of love, inside me.

In Paris the writer attended meetings of the revolutionary and artistic intelligentsia, during which he presented his new ideas and works. During one meeting chaired by Lunacharskii he gave a lecture on his idea of "honesty with oneself." It was later published as an article entitled "Pro moral' panuiuchykh i moral' pryhnoblenykh" [About Morality of Exploiters and Exploited] (1911), and was criticized by Lenin ("Pis'mo k Inesse Armand" [Letter to Inessa Armand] 1964a, 48: 285-86). During his stay in the French capital Vynnychenko also participated in the creation of the Ukrainian Association and became the founder of its artistic section in 1909 (Shkoropat, 55).[16] In 1910 the Association counted 120 members, a choir, and a Ukrainian-language course (Lanovyk, 232). Vynnychenko himself counted only 30 members of the association in 1909 (6 March 1909), whereas he had assumed that there was a total of 4,000 Ukrainians in Paris (22 September 1908). As a member of the Association he was in charge of organizing Ukrainian concerts to raise funds to erect a monument to Taras Shevchenko in Kyiv and exhibitions for the French public (15 October 1908). In his attempt to promote the Ukrainian nation he contacted the editors of the French journal *Courier Européen* to whom he suggested a column called "Ukraine." The journal was known to be a "tribune of oppressed nations" because it offered alternative points of view. The project failed because it required a donation of 10,000 francs annually (29 November 1912).

---

[15] Kokha was Vynnychenko's pet name for his wife Rosalia.

[16] Shkoropat refers to the work of Vynnychenko's contemporary Ievhen Bachyns'kyi, *Spohady* [Memoirs], who met him in Paris.

Occasionally, Vynnychenko stayed in resorts to improve his health. In the German spa of Kurbad, for example, he followed a course of fasting (24 February 1910).

Vynnychenko enjoyed meeting a variety of people, mainly those from the artistic intellectual milieu and revolutionaries, most of whom were émigrés from the Russian Empire. The latter came from different regions and were united by their opposition to the colonial and authoritarian tsarist rule. In 1908, while on Capri, he socialized with a group of intellectuals, which included such prominent figures as Lenin, Gorky, Lunacharskii, Bogdanov, etc. In a letter to Kotsiubyns'kyi he writes:

> Недавно познайомився тут з Горьким... Запрошував писати до „Знания". Звичайно, я з охотою згодився, тим паче на таких умовах, які запропонував він: писати по-укр[аїнському] і смому з рукопису перекладати свої роботи. Погано тільки, що завжди у його буває стільки всякого люду, що не можна до ладу побалакати і придивитися до сеї надзвичайно інтересної людини. А проте час маю, ще роздивлюсь. Та й люди теж цікаві: Богданов, Луначарський, Гусєв-Оренбурзький і ще якісь "звезды", яких я не встиг ще роздивитись ("Lystuvannia," 42).

> I recently met Gorky... He invited me to write for *Znaniie*. Of course, I agreed with pleasure, moreover on the conditions he himself offered: to write in Ukr[ainian] and then translate into Russian directly from manuscripts. The only bad thing is that so many people are constantly visiting him that I don't have enough time to talk and learn more about this very interesting person. I hope to have enough time for this. And there are interesting people here: Bogdanov, Lunachars'kyi, Gusev-Orenburz'kyi, and some other 'stars,' that I didn't have enough time to meet.

During these gatherings Vynnychenko participated in discussions and read his works, although his criticism of revolutionaries and individualism were not really welcomed. "Generally speaking, it is clear to me that they want writers to write sermons, and sermons of a very fanatical kind to boot" [Взагалі мені ясно, що їм хочеться, щоб художник писав проповіді, при тому самого фанатичного напряму], the writer confessed in a letter to Chykalenko (15 April 1908). Vynnychenko belonged to a group of Marxists, the so-called 'vsebichnyky,'[17] a term that Vynnychenko used to define those revolutionaries who recognized not only social and political but also individual and moral aspects of revolutionary change. This sparked criticism from another group of Marxists, the 'odnobichnyky'[18] who justified any means to reach the ultimate goal of social and political revolution. In a letter to Vynnychenko Gorky, in particular, criticized Vynnychenko's play *Bazar*,[19] in which the writer highlighted individual conflicts among revolutionaries united by one collective cause (2001, 116-117). This was the beginning of a conflict between the two writers. Gorky, as the editor-in-chief of the journal *Znaniie*, refused to publish Vynnychenko's works in Russian translation, although he had invited the Ukrainian writer to collaborate on this project.[20]

It is important to point out the change of Vynnychenko's social environment in Europe. Whereas in Ukraine, he, as a party member, had collaborated mainly with revolutionary circles, in Europe he began associating with members of the artistic intelligentsia. Certainly, one should not disregard the fact that there were many revolutionaries among these artists, many of whom expressed their revolutionary ideas. It was difficult to draw the line between the two camps, particularly during this period, when wide-ranging political and philosophical debates about societal changes were taking place.[21] There were not only political emigrants from the Russian Empire who flooded Europe after the defeat of the revolution of 1905-07, but also students and artists, who visited European universities and salons on a regular basis. Khrystia Alchevs'ka, a writer and teacher, completed her pedagogical studies in Paris (1902); Ievhen Chykalenko's son Levko, who was an archeologist and politician, studied at the University of Lausanne (1907-09); also active in these circles were the painter Mykola Kasperovych and the writer Nadiya Kybal'chych, and others. This change of social milieu influenced Vynnychenko and explains a number of problems in his writings (e.g., his abandonment of revolutionary themes for the themes of art and beauty), which now became more obvious from the perspective of displacement.

---

[17] 'Vsebichnyky' can be translated as 'all-sided [followers].'

[18] 'Odnobichnyky' are "one-sided [followers].'

[19] The play *Bazar* was published in 1910, but according to Gorky's letter, it was already written in 1909.

[20] Vynnychenko made this conflict public, publishing his "Lyst do Gor'kogo" [Letter to Gorky] in *Rada* 119 (10 June 1909): 4.

However, his contacts with the cultural society of the hostland were limited. In fact, during 1907-14 he could not boast of any contacts with prominent artistic groups or celebrated artists other than Russian émigrés, even though he attended artistic salons and was familiar with the Bohemian way of life in Paris (both *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and "Olaf Stefenzon" are based on this theme). In this respect, Vynnychenko differs from Archipenko. The latter's Modernism was measured purely by aesthetic principles that directed him to a broad international audience and eventually brought him recognition in the foreign milieu. Vynnychenko's Modernism had an ideological and political component that constantly underpinned his writings and directed them first of all to his native audience. Archipenko was more of an expatriate, who had left his homeland for an aesthetic purpose and managed to adjust completely to the hostland. Vynnychenko, in contrast, was more an émigré and exile, who always looked back and did not feel entirely comfortable in a foreign country. Definitely, there was a general atmosphere of Modernism present in all spheres of life, including gatherings in cafes, conversations, and readings on Nietzschean individualism, Marxist socialism, Bergsonian intuition, and various artistic trends on which Vynnychenko could focus during his stay in Europe. Apparently, like many prominent writers (e.g., Eliot and Joyce), Vynnychenko did not want to associate with any particular artistic group or trend.

---

[21] Lenin and Gorky are a good example. The former wrote a number of philosophical works before heading the revolution, whereas the latter, who was already a recognized writer, constantly 'played' at politics (e.g., Gorky participated in the congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party in London in 1907).

While in Geneva, Vynnychenko began working on translations of his works. He informed Chykalenko that his works were being translated in Vienna (4 December 1907).[22] After his encounters with Gorky and other Russian literati, he worked extensively on Russian-language translations. During this period, two publications of Latvian translations also appeared.[23] But his most daring project was to translate and stage his play *Bazar* into French. As is known from his letter to Chykalenko, Vynnychenko introduced the play to a French actress of Russian origin, who liked it and began translating it for the stage. "If a play is staged in Paris, it will go around the world," he declared, making plans for the future [Якщо п'єса поставлена в Парижі, то значить вона обійде цілий світ] (30 May 1909). It is likely that the play never appeared in a French version and he had to wait until 1921 for his plays to become popular in Europe.

---

[22] He probably meant the German translation of his story "Zina" that appeared in the journal *Ukrainische Rundschau* (1910).

[23] The Latvian translations were *Stahsti*. Riga: M. Tiller, 1912; and Wajatee. *Stahsti is kreewu rewoluzionaru dsihwes*. Tulk. I. A. Bite.—Wenden: A. Bite, 1913 (Stel'mashenko, 66). His writings were also known in Poland, where Vynnychenko was praised as a "novelist by God's grace" in the Polish journal *Krytyka* for his story "Taiemnist'" [Secrecy] (1912).

Vynnychenko's displacement in Europe fostered his intellectual growth.[24] Besides his contacts with artistic and intellectual circles, which stimulated him to reflections on his ideas, the writer made serious efforts to advance his education. In Geneva, as his letter to Chykalenko attests, he began studying French and attending lectures on literature.

> Крім того, думаю проштудіювати теорію і історію світової науки, філософії і літератури. Я ж—неук, як і більшість наших письменників. Через це почасти ми й не можемо конкурірувати з російськими і європейськими письменниками, хоч здатности, може, й не менші маємо (17 November 1907).

> I am also going to study theory and the history of world scholarship, philosophy, and literature. You know, I am an ignoramus, like the majority of our writers. That is perhaps why we cannot compete with Russian and European writers. Though perhaps we do not have less talent.

In 1908 he moved from Geneva to Paris, where he planned to takes courses in the sciences, philosophy, literature, and language at a university (20 August 1908). As the writer's correspondence and diary show, his reading included works on philosophy, psychology, and biology. He was particularly interested in questions of heredity, the role of instinct, unconsciousness, and the moral aspects of life. In his diary Vynnychenko noted the following works: *Nasledstvennost' i popytka ee obiasneniia* [Heredity and an Attempt at Its Explanation] by Vladimir Shimkevich; *Liubov' v prirode i razvitiie liubvi v zhivom mire* [Love in Nature and the Evolution of Love in the Living World] by Wilhelm Belshe; *Razvitiie nasledstvennosti* [The Evolution of Heredity] by O. Gerovich; *Nauka i nravstvennost'* [Science and Morals] by M. Bertel; the diary also records references to works by Henry Bergson, Ernest Renan, and Julius Wagner-Jauregg.[25] Vynnychenko made copious notes from these books in order to apply the new ideas to his works. This is evident from a letter from Chykalenko, who was strongly opposed to such influences: "I'm afraid that your answer to the critics [who criticized his play *Shchabli zhyttia*] will be the same as your play. I see this from your postcard, which says that you 'study scholarly works' to use them for your writings" (qt. in Panchenko, http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p2.shtml#2.2.%20). The application of these scholarly works is evident, for instance, in the novel *Bozhky*, in which the main protagonist, Vadym Stel'mashenko, reflects on the vital role of instinct in human life. He responds to speculation about 'crude instincts':

---

[24] It is interesting to note that even in the Russian Empire at the time exile fostered the intellectual growth of many exiles. As Moissaye Olgin notes: "Those who remained in Siberia for a longer term devoted their time to studies, and many a revolutionary returned from exile a well-read man" (355).

> Ти коли-небудь був голодний?... Знаєш, що таке цей інстинкт? Знаєш, як він може здути к чортовій матері всіх ваших божків... Ради ваших нещасних, брехливих, шкодливих божків ви запльовуєте—лицемірно, безсило запльовуєте!—те, що є єдино певне й тверде в людині, оті самі інстинкти! Замість того, щоб дивитись на них прямо, щоб виховувать їх, розвивать, ви плюєтесь і хочете бути жерцями! (200)

> Have you ever been hungry?... You know what this instinct is? You know how it can blow all your small gods to hell… For the sake of your poor, false, and pernicious petty gods you spit—hypocritically and impotently!—on the only thing that is certain and solid in a man, his instincts! Instead of examining them in a straightforward fashion in order to foster and develop them, you spit on them and want to become high priests!

Vynnychenko, as member of the artistic section of the Ukrainian Association in Paris, became interested in the visual arts, particularly painting and cinema. Besides providing an essentially modernist interest in new artistic media, the condition of displacement could have played a role in sparking Vynnychenko's new interests. With quite limited knowledge of the linguistic medium, displaced persons often found compensatory creative mechanisms in the visual arts. The language of painting is an international language that does not require linguistic knowledge. Noteworthy in this respect is that among the characters in his early works we find mostly painters (except for the poet Ostap in *Rivnovaha*): Kornii Kanevych (*Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*), Vasyl' ("Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku"), Arkadii (*Rivnovaha*), and Olaf Stefenzon and Diego Pables ("Olaf Stefenzon"). Actually, *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and "Olaf Stefenzon" make reference to the art of painting. Although certain art critics, among them Bohdan Pevnyi, Sviatoslav Hordyns'kyi, and Oleksandr Fedoruk did not find any examples of Vynnychenko's own painting, they speculate that he may have started painting during this period. His first known works are from the 1920s.

---

[25] Vynnychenko made references to these works in his diary (*Shchodennyk* 1: 41). I have not been able to trace the actual years of these publications.

It is likely that Vynnychenko became familiar with cinema only while he was in Europe. The first examples of cinematography reached Ukraine and the Russian Empire in 1896, and Vynnychenko may have seen them at home, but this cannot be established with any certainty.[26] His first mention of films refers to his very cursory comment on a film he saw in France (*Shchodennyk* 1: 40-41). Since the early films were silent, with only brief subtitles, they could be viewed with no problem by a broad international audience. However, it is also important to note that the influence of this medium as a significant Modernist agency found its way into Vynnychenko's writings (e.g., *Rivnovaha*).

---

[26] The films were screened in St. Petersburg (16 May 1896) (Shymon, 16) and Odesa (11 July 1896) (M. Ia. Landesman, 13).

Speaking about the positive factors of Vynnychenko's expatriation, we must also recognize that hardships were also common. For instance, the necessity to cover his living expenses stimulated him to write prolifically; literary work thus became the main source of his income. As a result, Vynnychenko is considered to be the first professional writer in Ukrainian letters who made a living exclusively through his craft (Rudnyts'kyi, 208). In his letter to Chykalenko from Geneva Vynnychenko complains that to survive by means of literature he must write four or five stories a month (17 November 1907). Describing his work schedule in 1910 in L'viv (13 November), he writes: "I go to bed at 10:00 p.m. and get up at 6:00 or 7:00 a.m. I leave the house only for lunch and don't sit around in cafés. All day long I work…" [Лягаю спати о десятій, встаю о 6 або 7-ій. Виходжу з хати тільки на обід і не сижу по кав'ярнях. Цілий день сижу за роботою...]. He sent his works to Ukrainian publishers (e.g., "Dzvin" [Bell]) and various periodicals (*Rada* [Council], *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk (LNV)*, *Ukrains'ka khata*), and prepared Russian and other translations. Ievhen Chykalenko, his 'literary godfather,' arranged privileged rates in *Rada* and helped him financially.

But the most necessary prerequisite for the writer was freedom. As Gurr says, "Freedom to write is a major stimulus to exile, and exile creates the kind of isolation which is the nearest thing to freedom that a twentieth-century artist is likely to obtain" (17). Writing in some sense becomes the only home for exiles (Said 1994, 147). Far away from social ties, political work, and police surveillance in the homeland, Vynnychenko enjoyed freedom during his European expatriation. He found Paris to be a particularly hospitable haven for writing. In a letter to Chykalenko, he says: "Would you believe that I feel best in Paris! For the first time I have found a quiet house, where I can focus on work for whole days…" [Уявіть собі, в Парижі я найкраще почуваю! Найшов уперше тиху хату, в якій цілі дні сиджу за роботою...] (29 October 1908). When it became boring for him in Paris, Vynnychenko could afford to leave for more quiet places like the Schwarzwald, situated in the mountains of Germany: "I escaped from Paris to focus on my work here" [[У]тік з Парижу, щоб попрацювати], he confesses to Chykalenko (3 January 1914). This sense of freedom from the pressures of everyday life and political repression, a unique stance of distance and detachment, and the opportunity for (self)-reflection influenced Vynnychenko's worldview and contributed to his quests as a modernist writer.

2.2.1. The Life of Displaced Modernist Artists

The life of displaced modernist artists became a theme in a number of Vynnychenko's works during this period, particularly in the play *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and the short stories "Chudnyi epizod" [A Curious Incident] (1910) and "Olaf Stefenzon." Although he did not stop working on revolutionary themes (e.g., *Bazar*; *Dochka zhandarma* [The Gendarme's Daughter], 1912; *Talisman* [The Talisman], 1913; *Po-svii*; and *Bozhky*, etc), a distinctly new direction in his writings appeared—the theme of art and beauty. Although some of his other works featured artists, they were either preoccupied with revolutionary and moral ideas (e.g., Kryvenko in *Memento*) or depicted as a part of an émigré community (e.g., Arkadii in *Rivnovaha*). In the works under consideration there are no references to revolutionary activities, neither is the author concerned about the past or social engagement of his characters. These works, which are usually set in the hostland, focus on aesthetics that reflect the weakening of

Vynnychenko's revolutionary activity and preoccupation with art as a response to his displacement and a form of his modernist stance. These works also reveal the writer's specific attitude toward modernist art—a balancing act between ideological and aesthetic principles.

The concept of beauty as an autonomous sphere of life emerged with the rise of Modernism in arts and literature and was practiced by such prominent figures as Baudelaire, Verlaine, Rimbaud, Mallarmé, and Wilde. Peter Bürger explains this change not only by formal aspects but also social progress. Aesthetism, in his opinion, is a result of the emergence of new classes in bourgeois society, in which an artist becomes a professional (32). Alienation from the Philistine atmosphere of society and a tendency to escape into art appear, along with social progress. The credo "Art for art's sake" perfectly reveals artists' escapist attitude toward society in search of their own 'ivory tower.' Cowley speaks about 'escape in art' of American and other expatriates as a central feature in a commercial society (236). At the same time there was an active attitude toward the arts—"Beauty will save the world"—as one that can help to improve people. In both cases, however, the modernist preoccupation with beauty signals the varying degrees of conflict and alienation and becomes a form of response to them. Artists found themselves internally displaced from their societies. Geographical displacement, on its part, adds a nuance to the general feeling of deracination: a displaced writer, losing touch with the social reality in the homeland, may emphasize the world of art and beauty—a more abstract, ideal, and perfect world. Moreover, the general situation with international communication, modernist experiments, and philosophical quests nourished many an artist during the *fin-de-siecle* period. Vynnychenko's contacts with artistic and intellectual circles, as I mentioned above, multiplied in Europe. He was part of a very international Bohemian way of life that was practiced in many large urban centres. His absence from his homeland and the limitations placed on his political activity in exile were possible factors behind his interest in the world of art. His Marxist views also played an important role in his active attitude toward art which, in his opinion, would stimulate social and moral changes. Both *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and "Olaf Stefenzon," which I shall now address, reflect Vynnychenko's new stance as a displaced writer exposed to new conditions of the hostland.

A. *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*

The idea of a play about "Parisian artists" appeared on 13 November 1910, when Vynnychenko was in L'viv. It was completed very quickly: in his letter to Chykalenko, sent from L'viv on 22 December 1910, the writer complained about the Russian imperial censors' ban on staging the play. Vynnychenko was very disappointed because it did not contain any political message (15 May 1911). Later, however, the ban was lifted, and the play was published in Kyiv in *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* [6 (1911): 385-431]. Its premiere, directed by Les' Kurbas, took place in Western Ukraine, in Stanislaviv (today: Ivano-Frankivs'k), in 1914. It also ran in Russian theatres, particularly in Saratov in 1915 or 1916 (*Shchodennyk* 1: 222).

The play takes place in the Parisian Bohemian milieu in the early twentieth century, and depicts the Ukrainian expatriate family of the painter Kornii Kanevych, his wife Ryta, their little son Lesyk, and Kornii's mother Hanna Semenivna. While finishing his greatest work, Kornii is challenged by his wife Ryta to sell it unfinished in order to obtain funds for medical treatment for their ailing son. Kornii cannot abandon his masterpiece, which results in the death of their son; Ryta destroys the canvas and then poisons herself and her husband.

Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid' considers the dilemma of artistic freedom versus everyday life and family responsibilities, and beauty versus paternal instincts—clearly a modernist theme. Kornii (Polar Bear) and Snizhynka represent admiration for the art of painting, whereas Ryta (Black Panther) and Hanna Semenivna represent life and the maternal instinct. Snizhynka can be viewed as a manifestation of art for art's sake and absolute artistic freedom in its opposition to traditional family values:

> Артист є жрець, артист—весь краса повинен бути, весь! Пелюшки, горщечки, колиски—це не його справа! Двом богам не служать! Хто хоче бути великим артистом, той не повинен бруднити себе. Ну що з того, що помре ваш Лесик? Будемо говорити, нарешті, прямо. Що з того? Ну, не стане на світі шматочка м'яса, яке кричить, робить неестетичні штуки і... і в'яже людей. А замість того ви станете вільним, легким, ви всі сили дасте тому, що вічно, що вище м'яса! Так-так, Медведю, гарний і бідний! Краса вічна. Ну, подумайте самі об'єктивно, холодно: не правду я кажу? (292-93)

> An artist is a high priest, an artist must be totally in beauty, totally! Diapers, pots, and cradles are not his business! One cannot serve two Gods! The one who wants to be a great artist must not sully himself. What does it really matter if your Lesyk dies? Let's speak frankly, finally. What of it? Well, a piece of meat that cries, does unaesthetic things departs the world and… and this binds people. But instead, you become free, light, you'll give all your efforts to what is eternal and higher than meat! Yes, yes, nice, poor Bear! Beauty is eternal. Well, think objectively, dispassionately: am I not saying the truth?

Kornii, however, constantly struggles between his paternal instincts and love of art. "What is beauty? What is human?" he asks Snizhynka. But he does not answer the question, leaving it an open-ended question for his readers (293). The artist realizes that it is impossible to avoid the biological nature of human instincts. When Snizhynka convinces him to get rid of this "burden of centuries," he replies: "One cannot unburden oneself of centuries… Hah! Lesyk and Panther are centuries. Do you understand, Snizhynka? No? Well, that's because you are Snizhynka" [Віків з себе не скинеш... Ха! А Лесик і Пантера—віки. Розумієте, Сніжинко? Ні? А, бо ви—Сніжинка] (295). At the same time Kornii cannot stop painting, unable to imagine how he can sell a work unfinished. This would symbolize his acquiescence to utilitarianism. He hopes that his son will get well soon and refuses to leave the dampness of Paris for sunny Italy, and this refusal leads ultimately to Lesyk's death.

Kornii's mother, Hanna Semenivna, represents the philistine attitude toward art, pointing to the uselessness of art and calling her son's painting "a piece of sackcloth" (284). As a representative of the older generation, her image is also linked with pragmatism, which is associated with bourgeois society. At the same time she symbolizes the total misunderstanding within the family and a profound generation gap. The modernist artist Kornii challenges the conservatism of old principles. In contrast, Ryta does not oppose her husband's art. But in the extreme situation of having to make a choice, her maternal instinct outweighs all other considerations: "Although these instincts are wild and blind—I can't help it… You must know this…" [Хай ці інстинкти дикі, сліпі—я не можу... От і знай це...] (305). Beauty for her is life itself. Speaking about the possible loss of their child, she articulates this philosophical point of view: "And what will you be left with? You will be empty, because life is only in this [their child], this is the most human. Will you accept cold, beautiful Snizhynka? Beauty? Kornii, life is not in beauty, beauty is in life, in love, and in this! (points to Lesyk). This is human…" [І з чим же ти зостанешся? Ти будеш порожній, бо життя тільки в цьому, це єсть найлюдське. Приймеш холодну, гарну Сніжинку? Красу? Життя, Нію, не в красі, краса в житті, в любові, ось в цьому! (Показує на Лесика). Це єсть людське...] (305). Ryta's words and the tragic finale of the play convincingly demonstrate that art cannot be separated from life; otherwise it is empty, anti-human, and leads to degeneration.

This reveals perfectly Vynnychenko's own attempt to seek a balance between form and content, aesthetic and utilitarian considerations. In his letter to Chykalenko the writer says that he is seeking new artistic forms but does not take them for granted:

> Я... відношусь з обережністю до всього нового і благорозумно стараюсь вибрати з його гарне, а погане залишити... Не можу уперто стояти на старих формах. Стиль, способи малювання Левицького не можуть бути прикладом. Так само і Тургенєв, і Золя, і Мопассан навіть оджили своє, а в свій час вони тим і були привабливі, що посувались вперед і шукали нового (21 January 1908).

> I… have a cautious attitude toward everything that is new and reasonably try to select what is beautiful in it and to reject what is bad… I cannot stubbornly follow old forms. The style and ways of depiction by Nechui-Levyts'kyi cannot be a model. Similarly, Turgenev, Zola, and Maupassant are now obsolete, but in their day they were interesting because they were progressive and were engaged in a search for new ways.

For Vynnychenko, literary form plays an important role as long as it helps to embody his ideas in a relevant fashion. In the play this is implied by Migueles's opinion of Kornii Kanevych's painting: "You, critics! Here are impressionism, realism, and naturalism? Isn't that right? Here is God! Understand?" [Ви, критики! Тут імпресіонізм, реалізм, натуралізм? Правда? Тут—бог! Розумієте?] (280).

Along with the theme of art and beauty, Vynnychenko also elaborates on aspects of expatriate life. This was the milieu in which the writer found himself in Europe, and its analysis will help us to understand Vynnychenko better as a displaced writer. It was his geographical move that enabled him to touch on foreign life and present quite an exotic and unique setting, which the Ukrainian reader perceived as novelty and originality.

Paris, the "capital of the world," is depicted as a modernist centre that attracts young, talented people from all over the world. "An artist does not have a nation" is a phrase from the play, which is heard during a discussion among young artists. It aptly illustrates the modernist inclination toward cosmopolitanism, nurtured by a fascination with art and beauty. Vynnychenko depicted this scene very masterfully, as though the phrase had come from an unidentified person (275). The International Bohemian life is represented by artistic circles and expatriates of various ethnic backgrounds: the Ukrainian family of Kanevych, the Scandinavian Janson, the Spaniard Migueles, the Englishman Black, and the Frenchman Lemonier. Another Frenchman, named Moulin, is a local critic and journalist. He has connections in the French artistic world and also represents the capitalist attitude toward art, i.e., conducting a profitable business in art works. Moulin, for instance, offers to pay Kornii an advance on his painting because he will sell it later for a better price. He also exploits the Kanevyches' financial difficulties and wants to make Ryta his lover.

The author uses specific words from various national languages to characterize the artists' national affiliation: Migueles is, thus, referred to as senor Migueles; Black is called "Sir Black" and uses the English word "yes" during conversations. Other individuals have affiliations to art rather than nations: Sappho, Mimi, and Cardinal. They greet each other with the international salutation *servus*. The use of French words (e.g., franc, garçon, madame, adieu, pardon, comprenez, monsieur, bonjour) and phrases (e.g., mon cher, c'est ça, tres bien; voila tout, mon ami) provide a flavour of French reality, although the play does not represent local life widely but only the specific—artistic—segment that Vynnychenko knew best.

The life of international Bohemia is full of discussions about new trends in art and artists' commitment, meetings in cafes to drink alcohol, sing songs, flirt, and play cards. Especially effective in this respect is Act Two staged in an artistic cabaret, which Cardinal calls "brats'ka obytel'" [a buddy's cottage]. The waiters know all their patrons well, allowing Kornii, e.g., to pay his bill the next day (302). Here is how Vynnychenko introduces some of the visitors of the cabaret: "Cardinal—is a dignified individual, with long hair, not young and dressed with a pretension for originality, Lemonier is a beautiful young man with a gloomy face; Mimi is a sweet "model"; Sappho is lively and restless. Waiters are moving around" [Кардинал—поважний суб'єкт, з довгим волоссям, немолодий, одягнений з претензією на оригінальність, Лемоньє—гарний юнак з похмурим лицем; Мімі—гарненька "модель"; Сафо—жвава, непосидлива. Побіля крутяться гарсони] (288). One can also learn about the beverages they drank in Parisian cafes—"Ajax," "Vos," and "Blance." The act ends with an intriguing gambling scene: Kornii plays cards with Moulin. If Moulin had won, he would have been allowed to take Ryta as his lover. However, Kornii wins and takes his wife back.

Kanevych, a Ukrainian artist living abroad, is depicted as a member of the international Bohemia in Paris, and neither he nor his wife Ryta longs for their homeland. Even Kornii's mother, Hanna Semenivna, rather unnaturally, never mentions it. Confronting the illness of their son, the parents plan to go for a holiday from "gloomy Paris" to "sunny Italy," not to Ukraine. Larysa Moroz's statement that the Kanevyches lost their homeland is sheer speculation, as no scene in the play explicitly refers to this fact (95). It would be difficult to admit that Kanevych, who is totally immersed in the world of art, is involved in revolutionary activity at home. He is a typical expatriate attracted by Bohemian life in one of the largest European urban centres. In this respect, the image of Kanevych resembles the Ukrainian sculptor Archipenko, who arrived in Paris in 1908—not the political activists who had fled from police persecution. Kanevych and other expatriate artists enjoy this very international artistic milieu and have no plans to go home.

The only reference to Ukraine is made by Snizhynka, but her remark expresses neither an exile's feeling of nostalgia nor interest in the current events in her homeland; it is a historical allusion to the Zaporozhian Sich[27] of the Ukrainian Cossacks, which she uses as an argument in a discussion about freedom of art: only artists who are absolutely free from everyday routines and family burdens can achieve success, like the Cossacks, who did not allow women into their midst.

The displaced condition is important in the study of *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* in that it serves as a key factor that determines the finale. The real reason underlying the tragic deaths of the members of the Kanevych family is the lack of financial stability, a typical challenge for Bohemian artists and émigrés.[28] Kanevych has success with his painting and manages to provide his family with basic living needs. However, when confronted with his little son's illness and the need to pay for medicine and a trip to Italy, he finds himself in a dilemma: sell his unfinished work (symbolizing a betrayal of genuine art) or complete it (thus putting his son in danger and affecting his paternal instincts). Despite Ryta's insistence on taking active measures to save their son, Kornii, although he struggles with his inner feelings, hesitates, arguing that he cannot stop working on his painting. The artist in him is adamant, whereas Ryta's maternal instinct leads to a tragic end: after her son's death she destroys the canvas and kills Kornii and herself.

---

[27] The Sich was a fortified territory on which the Ukrainian Cossacks lived and prepared for their military campaigns.

[28] This was not the case with expatriates who could take advantage of generous currency exchange rates in new countries (e.g., American expatriates in France during the 1920s).

Although the finale may seem symbolic, there is a certain truth to it, reflecting the poverty that was typical of Bohemian circles, which often led to suicide. Emblematic of this problem are the letters sent from Ospedaletti (Italy) in which the Ukrainian writer Nadiya Kybal'chych (Kozlovs'ka) (1878-1916) asked Kotsiubyns'kyi to find her some literary work in order to survive:

> I am writing to you with a request. I need money, and I'd like to ask you if you could find translations into Ukrainian or Russian from Ukr[ainian], Rus[sian], Pol[ish] and Italian. No matter how miserable the payment is, I'll do translations... (Maznyi, 3: 22; 8 March 1911)
>
> ...[I] am in such material conditions that sometimes I feel like there's nothing for it but to die. This year my husband was very ill the entire winter and could not earn anything... but I have to think about it [money] first of all not for a good life but in general for life, even the most miserable (ibid., 23; 2 April 1911).

Later Kybal'chych committed suicide because of her poverty. As is known from a letter written by Gorky's wife, Mariia Peshkova, to Kotsiubyns'kyi, dated 17 May 1912, this was also the case with Kolpinskii, the husband of the Russian writer A. Kolpinskaia, who lived on Capri (ibid., 4: 55).

Vynnychenko constantly struggled with his poor financial state, and this preoccupation was reflected in all of his works about émigré life (e.g., "Taina," *Rivnovaha* and "Olaf Stefenzon"). Yet he was still able to travel and even to afford staying in resorts for health reasons. His financial situation depended mainly on the publications of his literary works, and was similar to the marketability of painters' or other visual artists' works, though the latter had the advantage of local markets, as visual arts did not require much linguistic interpretation. These were two sides of the Bohemian coin: a merry life and creative atmosphere of the international artistic milieu and poverty, bordering on an existential crisis—all of which Vynnychenko experience personally and portrayed in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*.

Along with addressing the theme of art and aspects of expatriate life, there was another consequence of Vynnychenko's displacement—the introduction of non-realist, namely symbolist, elements in his predominantly realistic narrative. Significantly, symbolist intentions were almost absent in Vynnychenko's works before his emigration (except some works, e.g., "Krasa i syla"). The encounter with Europe intensified his interest in modernist artistic trends (evident in his letter to Chykalenko and Migueles's reference to a variety of artistic movements, cf. 84).

But we must also take into account another reason that might explain the emergence of this feature. Speaking about the connection between geographical displacement and literary forms, Milosz, who was an exile himself, says: "[T]he condition of exile, by enforcing upon a writer several perspectives, favors other genres and styles, especially those which are related to a symbolic transposition of reality" (282). Vynnychenko's long absence from his homeland weakened his vivid impressions of everyday experience.[29] However, this was compensated by his greater penetration into the world of abstract ideas and search for adequate forms. Vynnychenko's phrase "I don't see real people, but my ideas are always with me" [я не бачу живих людей, але мої ідеї завжди зі мною] clearly identifies his new stance (5 February 1910).

---

[29] The best examples of displaced writers' retreat from realistic to non-realistic literary devices are the writings of Joyce and Nabokov. After the publication of his realistic *Dubliners* (1914, written much

Vynnychenko was among the first writers to introduce symbolist dimensions into Ukrainian drama. His contemporary, Voronyi, declared that *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* was a play with a dual artistic basis, realism and symbolism, and called it a drama of 'living symbols' [drama zhyvykh symvoliv]: "Taking out of a protagonist what constitutes the tragedy of his life, an actor creates a new person, projects his inner struggle and conflict, and begets two strong individuals who constantly influence each other. The second person, being a symbol, is also real…" (410). Voronyi found symbolist parallels between Vynnychenko's play and the works of Hauptman, Ibsen, and Stanisław Wyspiański.[30]

Although *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* seems to convey real events and real characters, its symbolic aspect is quite visible. Kornii and Snizhynka symbolize artistic freedom and the idea of aesthetic beauty, whereas Ryta and Hanna Semenivna symbolize life and human instincts. Vynnychenko's symbolic intentions are also manifested through the names and descriptions of characters. Unlike the real names in his previous works, such as Antonyna (*Memento*), Andrii Karpovych and Natalia Pavlivna (*Brekhnia*),

---

earlier), Joyce wrote the self-reflective *Portrait of the Artsit as a Young Man* (1914-15), then the mythical *Ulysses* (1922), and finally *Finnegans Wake* (1939), whose significance, in Joyce's words, was "completely above reality" (qt. in Hoffmeister, 132). After publishing a series of realistic novels on Russian émigré themes (e.g., *Mashen'ka*, 1926 and *Zashchita Luzhina*, 1930), in the 1930s Nabokov began to experiment, manipulating characters and plots and engaging in word games (e.g., *Invitation to a Beheading*, 1938 and *The Real Life of Sebastian Knight*, 1941, etc).

[30] Vynnychenko's use of symbolic devices within the broad context of the Ukrainian drama is addressed in Khorob, Stepan. *Ukrains'ka moderna drama kintsia XIX-pochatku XX stolittia: neoromantyzm, symvolizm, ekspresionizm* [Ukrainian Modern Drama at the End of the Nineteenth-the Beginning of the Twentieth Century: Neo-Romanticism, Symbolism, Expressionism]. Ivano-Frankivs'k: Plai, 2002.

Marusia (*Bazar*),[31] here the playwright uses symbolic names: Polar Bear (Kornii). Panther (Ryta) and Snowflake. They are not only motivated by the characters' individual features but also allude to a symbolic reality. Polar Bear symbolizes both Kornii's awkwardness and strength: "He is large, a little bit clumsy, has luxurious, long blond hair, like a mane, his face… with an expression of kind and quiet strength. With his two hands he combs his hair back and on his thick legs paces around the atelier with small steps…" [Великий, трохи незграбний, мішкуватий, має довге пишне біле волосся, як грива, лице... з виразом доброї, спокійної сили. Нахмурено, обома руками розчісує волосся назад і дрібними кроками товстих ніг ходить по ательє...] (273). Ryta also justifies her association with a black panther: "She is thin, svelte, dressed in black, her face with sharp features and well developed jaws; her face is ardent, almost wild and rough, but pretty" [Дуже тонка, гнучка, одягнена в чорне, лице з різкими рисами, розвиненими щелепами; лице жагуче, майже дике і грубе, але гарне] (ibid.). Her association with black colour also adequately conveys her suffering for art and her child. But the most symbolic name is Snowflake, which is not a real name but a symbol of beauty and grace: "She is beautiful, bright white, all soft and lively, with bright red lips. Her gestures are slow and gracious, like the flight of snowflakes, she is dressed with delicate and cultivated taste; she admires herself and is aware of the power of her beauty and attractiveness" [Вона гарна, ясно-біла, вся пухка і жвава, з яскраво-червоними губами. Рухи повільні і граціозні, як лет сніжинок, вбрана з тонким і випещеним смаком, любується собою й почуває владу своєї краси і привабливості] (276). Even her language betrays her symbolic nature. Her remark "I can lose nothing" implies her abstractness and eternity, because art cannot disappear (279). We do not know her real name or where she came from. She sings a French song:

---

[31] However, the name of Tsinnist' Markovych [Value Markovych] from *Bazar* seemes to be an exception.

> Si vous voulez de l'amour
> Ne perdez pas un jour (291).

Moroz claims that Snizhynka is a Ukrainian, for she mentions a fact from Ukraine's history (97). But this statement may be debatable, for she seems to belong everywhere and nowhere. Snizhynka's boyfriend is a Scandinavian named Janson, but she wants to win the attention of the Ukrainian artist Kornii to help him get rid of his family burden so that he can devote himself entirely to art. In a sense she is a kind of deity, who requires obedience to art.

While the denotation of Snizhynka as snowflake and its association with the colour white might persuade readers that she is a perfect match for Kornii the Polar Bear,[32] Ryta's association with the colour black implies their incompatibility, which Kornii himself articulates: "Well? Here [we have] two powers… that have clashed… That's my opinion… I have nothing to repent" [Що ж? Тут дві сили... стукнулись... Так мені здається... Каятись нема чого] (292). The importance of this play with symbolic colour is also noted by Ryta. After entering the cabaret, she exclaims: "Ah! Polar Bear is here with White Snowflake?" [А! Білий Медвідь єсть із білою Сніжинкою?] (295).

The modernist features of *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, such as its provocativeness and novelty, was severely criticized by populist critics. In Ivan Steshenko's opinion, "this play is not a play at all: it shows neither everyday life, nor impressionistic mood, nor real characters" (qt. in Stel'mashenko, 121).[33] He treats the main protagonist, Kornii, quite literally as an abnormal person: "Everything that Kanevych [Kornii] does, including his painting of his dead child, is pathological and pertains to animals, but not all of them" (ibid.). It is clear that the critic did not grasp the main message of the play (indicative of its high intellectual level and complexity), claiming that Vynnychenko supported the motto "an artist must be absolutely free and serve only beauty" and even accused him (not appropriately) of Nietzscheanism (ibid.). Furthermore, Steshenko did not appreciate the exoticism and uniqueness of the foreign setting. As he argues, there is not the slightest national, professional, class background or one that is common to all mankind in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*. In many respects, Steshenko's critique echoes Nechui-Levyts'kyi's position that literature must reflect real people (cf. 44-45).

---

[32] In Ukrainian, polar bear is "white bear."

What seems to bother critics like Steshenko is the sense of a conventionalized setting in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and in Vynnychenko's other plays. Meyer Howard Abrams defines setting in the following way: "The setting of a narrative or dramatic work is the general locale, historical time, and social circumstances in which its action occurs; the setting of an episode or scene within a work is the particular physical location in which it takes place" (172). National attributes were required by the traditional Ukrainian theatre (e.g., traditional clothing, kitchen utensils, and landscapes) to render a realistic picture of a scene. Modernist playwrights, such as Lesia Ukrainka, Spyrydon Cherkasenko, and Vynnychenko, departed from this tradition (although there are rare examples of it in Vynnychenko's works, e.g., in *Moloda krov* [Young Blood]) to embracing a theatre of ideas. Philosophical problems prevail in Vynnychenko's writings during this period, and the real social background is quite superficial and plays a secondary role (Moroz, 19). Events are often limited to one room but the ideas are not restrained. The conflict between art and life could have happened anywhere: in Moscow, Kyiv, or London. Conventionalized reality is not bound to one place but does have the potential of a broad international appeal. Revuts'kyi pointed out this conventionalized setting as a distinguishing feature of Vynnychenko's dramaturgy, which made him a "writer of eternal and important (until now) problems" (44). Vynnychenko's innovative approach to dramatic setting actually secured the success of *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and other plays.

---

[33] Stel'mashenko was referring to Steshenko, Ivan. "Mystetstvo v rozuminni Vynnychenka" [Art in Vynnychenko's Understanding]. *Siaivo* [Kyiv] 5-6 (1913): 143-53.

The play had a number of positive reviews. Iaroslav Vesolovs'kyi noted at the première that Vynnychenko's work was "interesting and strong with its theatrical effects of a modernist drama" (qt. in Stel'mashenko, 123).[34] After moving to Kyiv, Les' Kurbas, who was famous for his ground-breaking achievements in the Ukrainian theatre, staged the play in the "Molodyi teatr" [Young Theatre] in 1917 (Kurbas, 485). It was also successfully performed by the Russian theatre in Berlin in the early 1920s. During this period *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* was published and staged in Germany and also made into a film. The critic Mykhailo Rudnyts'kyi wrote that this play had more lasting value than others: "[The play's] problem of a conflict between an artist's obligation to his creative work and family did not become dated as quickly as the pseudo-principles of sexual morality, implemented by Vynnychenko with the harshness of a party program" (qt. in Moroz, 103). Much later, in 1980, the play was staged by a Ukrainian theatre in the

---

[34] Stel'mashenko was referring to Vesolovs'kyi, Iaroslav. "Z teatru i muzyky." [From Theatre and Musical News] *Dilo* [L'viv] 89 (25 April 1914): 5-6.

US which, as usual, sparked a passionate debate in the diasporan press about its virtues and flaws.[35] After Vynnychenko was rehabilitated during *perebudova* [perestroika] in Soviet Ukraine, *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* regained its success in Ukraine (Moroz, 94).[36]

B. "Olaf Stefenzon"

"Olaf Stefenzon" was first published in the journal *Dzvin* [Bell] (L'viv) in 1913 (1: 8-19; 2: 60-79).[37] In this story Vynnychenko continues to elaborate on the theme of art and beauty, which shows that his interest in this theme was not casual. The story portrays an international group of artists whose creative preoccupations overlap with their individual relationships. The narrator, an unnamed sculptor from Ukraine, accidentally meets the Swedish painter Olaf Stefenzon on a Paris street; the latter brings the Ukrainian into the circle of a certain Mr. Valdberg, an art connoisseur from Germany. Having been ignored by traditional bourgeois art critics when he was a young artist, Mr. Valdberg now devotes all his money to supporting talented artists who introduce innovations in art. He organizes a contest that includes a monetary award and a very unusual prize: marriage to Emma, his daughter. In the final stage of the contest, an experienced Spanish painter, Diego Pables (Don Diego) competes against an amateur Swede, Olaf Stefenzon, a former turner who began painting accidentally. After a series of mysterious events (Stefenzon's work is ruined; and an attempt to destroy Pables's work by arson), the Spaniard wins the contest. Stefenzon suddenly goes home, leaving Emma in despair.

---

[35] Tarnavs'ka, Marta. "*Chorna Pantera* i chorna pliama na sovisti" [Black Panther and a Black Stain on the Conscience]. *Svoboda* [New Jersey] 74 (18 April 1981): 2, 4; Vanchyts'ka, Irena. "Shche pro *Chornu Panteru*" [Again about Black Panther]. *Svoboda* [New Jersey] 95 (21 May 1981): 2, 3.

[36] Larissa Onyshkevych, a specialist on contemporary Ukrainian drama, mentioned in a letter to me that Vynnychenko's plays, including *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, were popular in Ukrainian theatres from the early 1990s.

[37] Here I am referring to the edition: "Olaf Stefenzon" in Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. *Krasa i syla. Povisti ta opovidannia.* pp. 613-63. Kyiv: Dnipro, 1989.

Despite the similarities of choice between art and feelings in both *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and "Olaf Stefenzon," the latter broadens the discussion about art and the depiction of displaced modernist artists, and provides more details about their Bohemian life in Paris. "Olaf Stefenzon" continues the discussion about art, which shifts from the philosophical generalizations in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* to more critical reflections. Pables and Stefenzon display quite a similar formal technique, which synthesizes realism with new modernist trends. What is technique and what is content are two key questions for Vynnychenko. Examining Stefenzon's painting, a portrait of a blacksmith, the narrator points out its fusion of styles: "This was some sort of mixture of realism, impressionism, and even primitivism" [Це була якась мішанина з реалізму, імпресіонізму, символізму і навіть примітивізму] (626). But what he highlights is the attempt to create the image of a real human being:

> В цій паршивенькій мазанині теж нема того, що можна назвати тільки людським. Але в ній є стремління до того, стремління дати не тільки високу техніку, а й високий, *людський* матеріал. Людина—це рух переживання, це думка, радість, печаль, мрія, страждання, надія. Техніка? Форма? Давайте її сюди, давайте найкращу, найдосконалішу форму: імпресіонізм, примітивізм, натуралізм, чорт-біс, все, що може найкраще обкреслити людину, давайте все сюди! Але ж людське обкреслюйте, а не собаче! (628)

> In this rather bad daubing there is also nothing that may be called human-like. But there is a striving for this, a striving to demonstrate not only a superior technique but also perfect *human* material. A human being is the movement of experience; it is thought, joy, sorrow, dreams, suffering, and hope. Technique? Form? Give it here, give me the best and the most perfect form: impressionism, primitivism, naturalism, oh

> damn, everything that can best depict a person, give it all here! But portray something that resembles a human, not a dog!

In contrast, a certain contempt for the human element dominates Pables's painting, although he has a more sophisticated technique. Examining his work, the narrator reflects:

> Це було щось таке гидке, при погляді на яке мимоволі могло прийти в голову питаня: що єсть мистецтво? Що це за сила, яка примушує навіть на таку огиду дивитись з хвилюванням, з незрозумілою приємністю, з вдячністю до автора ціе мерзоти?
>
> На картині було: стіл широкий, низький, немов роздавлений вагою пляшок і закусок; за столом чоловік. Цей чоловік був центром всеї композиції, він їв. Лоб у його був вузький, лисий, жовто-рожевий, покритий легким жиром. Од лоба розходились вниз щоки, падаючи білуватими м'якими брижами на обмотану круг шиї серветку. Лице звичайного одгодованого рантьє.
>
> Але вираз його був не зовсім звичайний: це було лице людини, яка робить щось гидке, знає про це й раює з того, раює лукаво, злорадно, самовдоволено... (653)

> This was something so hideous that when you looked at it a question might involuntarily come to mind: what is art? What is this power that makes us look even at such hideousness with anxiety, with incomprehensible pleasure, with gratitude to the author of this abomination?
>
> In the picture there was a wide, low table, as though squashed beneath the weight of bottles and snacks; there was a man sitting at the table. This man was the centre of the composition; he was eating. His forehead was narrow, bald, yellowish-pink, lightly covered with fat. Beneath his forehead were his cheeks, falling in whitish soft folds onto a napkin tied around his neck. It was a face of an ordinary, well-fed investor.
>
> But his expression was not quite ordinary: it was the face of the man who does something vile, who knows this and takes pleasure in this archly, maliciously, and self-righteously...

The comparison between the two works and their creators serves to develop Vynnychenko's understanding of modernist art, which he presented in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and his article "Sposterezhennia neprofesionala" (published the same year as "Olaf Stefenzon"). The narrator, Vynnychenko's alter-ego, observes the life and works of the two artists and clearly takes Stefenzon's side. The Swede does not ignore any formal devices as long as they help to convey the content better. Although he is not as experienced as Pables, he seems to be on the right track and is conscious of his commitment to criticize the formalistic exuberance and thematic emptiness of bourgeois art: "What is contemporary painting?.. It is one huge picture of the over-perfection of modern capitalist technique. Technique is the only healthy nerve of the bourgeoisie. More technique, better technique, technique worthy of the greatest genius!" [Що таке сучасне малярство?.. Це одна величезна картина передосконалості сучасної капіталістичної техніки. Техніка—це єдиний здоровий нерв буржуазії. Побільше техніки, кращу техніку, найгеніальнішу техніку!] (627-28). Olaf's choice of content, the blacksmith's portrait, is quite indicative of his intention. A blacksmith symbolizes the working people, the class that will supersede the bourgeois in a new socialist society. The blacksmith has the same social status as Olaf the turner, and in some sense his portrait is autobiographical. Stefenzon's focus on humanity is his particular trait, which one reviewer overlooked[38] in *Ukrains'ka khata*. The reviewer called him "a typical representative of bourgeois society, who is only in pursuit of a new technique and style" ("Olaf Stefenzon" 1913, 313).

On the other hand, Pables is portrayed as a representative of art for art's sake, who only seeks formal refinement. His image of the investor is deliberately presented to contrast with Olaf's blacksmith. The investor belongs to the bourgeois class and is destined to lose his social status under socialism. The narrator associates this image of Pables's work with the painter himself and with his stance of a self-righteous bourgeois:

---

[38] The name was not indicated, but it could have been either Sriblians'kyi or Ievshan.

> Він [Дієго Паблес] мені мало подобався. Це був наш типічний "брат художник". Він нічим не цікавився, крім мистецтва, та й то тільки свого власного; балакав на теми еротичні або малярські. Коли на еротичні, то поганенько-солодко сміявся, і сміх у його вилітав такими згуками: кях-кях-кях! Коли ж на малярські, то всіх лаяв, а себе хвалив з такою одвертістю, що ставало навіть не ніяково, а дивно й трохи неспокійно: чи не хворий цей добродій? В інших випадках, коли говорилось про політику або про музику й спів Емми..., він пихкав люлькою й без нудьги, але з повним байдужжям мовчав (643-44).

> I did not like him [Diego Pables] very much. He was a typical "fellow painter." He did not care about anything except art, and then only his own; he babbled about erotica and painting. When he talked about erotica, he would laugh lasciviously, and his laughter was accompanied with these sounds: kiakh-kiakh-kiakh! When he talked about painting, he rebuked everybody but praised himself so frankly that everyone became not just embarrassed, but perplexed and uneasy: is this gentleman crazy? When there was talk about politics or music or Emma's singing… he puffed his pipe and was not bored but remained silent with utter indifference.

The contrast between these two artists is also emphasized by their individual temperament. Olaf is very shy and uncommunicative, but with a strong inner energy and will. Interestingly, he always covers his painting, so that no one can see it before the contest. Meanwhile, Pables is an obtrusive and selfish person. He does not hide his painting and is convinced of his victory. This contrast is also implied by Mr. Valdberg when he talks about modern art:

> Культура, справжня культура—соромлива, непомітна, некриклива; вона ховається по тихих місцях і не гвалтує про себе на ринках. Взять найвищу прояву її—мистецтво. Ці салони, виставки, магазини "відомих" художників,—хіба це справжнє мистецтво? Це—фальсифікація, це—гній, це—мертве! (632)

> Culture, genuine culture, is bashful, unremarkable, not ostentatious; it hides in quiet places and does not shout about itself in marketplaces. Take its highest manifestation—art. All these salons, exhibits, and stores of 'famous' painters—is this genuine art? This is falsification, this is muck, it is dead!

To a certain extent Emma is a symbolic person, balanced between two different styles and painters. The writer maintains the mystery to the end of the story, so that the reader does not actually know whom she prefers. Like Ryta the Black Panther in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedvid'*, Emma suffers for art; and like Snizhynka, she is obedient to art and thus does not have any choice but to follow her personal feelings. According to the contest rules, she has agreed to become the wife of the contest winner for ten years. The finale of the story implies that she is unhappy with Pables's victory, which symbolizes the victory of formalism over content and technical considerations over human ones. Here is how the heroine reacts to Olaf's sudden departure from Paris at the end of the story:

> Емма вмить сильно прикусила нижню губу так сильно, що вона вся побіліла й натягнулась. Коли губа лягла на своє місце, на най синіли глибокі сліди зубів; з одного виступила кров.
>
> —Сама винна...—прошепотіла немов про себе Емма і, повернувшись, не попрощавшись, помалу вийшла з хати (663).

> Emma suddenly bit her low lip so hard that it turned white and taut. When her lip returned to normal, there were deep blue marks from her teeth; one mark was bleeding.
>
> —It's my fault... Emma whispered as though about herself. Then she turned around and left the house without saying good-bye.

Besides discussions about art, the story gives us a broader picture of the Parisian artistic milieu than *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*. It also adds some nuances to the portrayal of the life of a displaced Ukrainian artist, showing us an exile's feelings and raising the issue of Ukrainian identity in Europe.

As in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, the Parisian Bohemia is multinational in "Olaf Stefenzon," featuring a Swede, two Germans, the Ukrainian narrator, and various unidentified voices of people of other nationalities. This is actually Vynnychenko's first work in which he focuses on foreigners, not Ukrainian émigrés. Only the narrator is Ukrainian, an incidental figure who simply observes the life of the hostland as if from the sidelines. We do not know about his past and even what kind of sculptures he creates. Instead, he recounts the story of Olaf Stefenzon, how he began to paint after an accident at a factory and found his calling as an artist. (Interestingly, this may be an autobiographical parallel with Vynnychenko who also accidentally began painting in Europe.)

Artists are recognizable on city streets, and Emma spots an artist in the narrator:

> —Скажіть, ви—художник, правда?
>
> —Я скульптор.
>
> —Ну, от! Я так і знала. Я зразу побачила. І це все пояснює. Мій батько—художник, і я виросла серед малярів, скульпторів і чую їх навіть крізь таку стіну туману, як добрий собака своїх людей... (615)

> —Tell me, you're an artist, aren't you?
>
> —I'm a sculptor.
>
> —Well! I knew it. I saw it at once. And that explains everything. My father is an artist, and I grew up among painters and sculptors and I feel them even through this wall of fog, like a good dog recognizes his people…

Walking together, the narrator also recognizes another stranger as an artist, because he is wearing a hat with a wide brim (616). Later the stranger is identified as Olaf Stefenzon. Pables's fashionable shoes, as well as the fact that he is addressed formally as Don Diego might betray his membership in an elite group. After their acquaintance, the Ukrainian narrator moves into the Swede's studio. Together they go to the Louvre, where Stefenzon wants to examine Botticelli's works, most likely in the interests of his work (644). Vynnychenko mentions a number of foreign languages heard at the building where Pables live. Some sound quite exotic to the narrator, who cannot identify them (657).

The absence of French characters is another important feature of the story. It seems easier for the narrator to establish contact with migrants like himself. Even an accent can help, as it did during the first meeting between the narrator and Emma:

> —Ви—чужоземець? Правда?—зараз же спитала вона, ніби боячись, що я замовкну й на цьому кінчиться наша розмова.
> —Чужоземець,—одповів я.—А ви теж, здається, не парижанка?
> —Ні, я німкеня... (614)

> —You are a foreigner, aren't you?—She asked right away, as though afraid that I would stop talking and our conversation would end.
> —I am a foreigner,—I answered.—But you're not a Parisian either, are you?
> —No, I'm German...

Although Vynnychenko depicts the narrator as a Bohemian, who is preoccupied above all with art, he is characterized by certain elements pertaining to exile. Although the narrator does not pine for his homeland, he seems to be quite lonely. This loneliness is masterfully conveyed through sullen colours in the portrayal of gloomy Parisian scenes that remind us of Vynnychenko's uneasiness with the weather in the hostland:

> Одного вечора я вийшов пройтися по вулицях Парижа. Весь день стояв такий густий туман, що, здавалось, будинки були спущені в сиву мильну воду. Світло скрізь запалили вже з третьої години, і воно каламутними розбризканими плямами жовтіло в біловатій густій напівтьмі. Дихати було трудно,—повітря

> було кисле, густе і нагадувало насичену парою атмосферу холодного передбанника (613).
>
> One evening I went out for a walk on the streets of Paris. All day there was such dense fog that it seemed as if the houses had sunk into gray, soapy water. Lights had been turned on everywhere from 3:00 p.m. and they glowed with muddy splashes of yellow colour in the thick, whitish semi-darkness. It was difficult to breath—the air was acrid and dense and resembled the atmosphere of a cold corridor filled with steam.

The depiction of streets and people also implies the writer's discomfort and feeling of being out of place:

> В тумані, як і раніше, з грохотом, звоном і ревом совались трамваї та екіпажі; кліпали й трусились жирні плями світла магазинів і ліхтарів; люди вистрибували й зникали коло мене, як витвори хоробливої фантазії. Я підняв комір пальта, закурив і плюнув: мало чого не буває серед цеї громади сотнів тисяч набитих людьми кам'яних скринь, в липкій, пронизуватій каламуті туманів і випарів болот? (618)
>
> Like before, the trams and carts rumbled in the fog with a clamour and ringing; the greasy stains of lights from the shops and lanterns blinked and trembled; people jumped out and disappeared near me, like creatures from a morbid fantasy. I raised the collar of my coat, lit a cigarette, and spat: God knows what transpires in this mass of hundreds of thousands of stone boxes crowded with people, in this piercing mud of fog and swamp vapours?

"Olaf Stefenzon" represents the dilemma of Vynnychenko as a writer from a colonized and unrecognized nation. Here is how Emma reacts to the introduction of the Ukrainian narrator to her circle:

> Я трошки зам'явся,—скажи їм, а вони все одно не знатимуть, хто я.
>
> —А я українець,—усе ж таки проговорив я з таким виглядом, немов всьому світові давно відомо, що це за птиця—українець.
>
> —Qu'est-ce que c'est?!—високо підняла свої густі брови панна.

> Я почухався й почав розказувати. Але панна недослухала—тим краще, ще одна нація (621).
>
> I hesitated a little bit,—if you tell them, they still won't know who I am.
>
> —And I am a Ukrainian,—I said as though everyone in the world has long known what the Ukrainian species is.
>
> —Qu'est-ce que c'est?!—the young lady raised her thick brows.
>
> I scratched myself and began to speak. But the lady didn't listen to the end—it's nice to know that one more nation exists.

Though ironic, Emma's remark indicates the international atmosphere and modernist cosmopolitanism of a large European centre, a kind of contemporary ideal of multicultural society: the more diversity, the better. But therein lies the problem: Emma is totally indifferent to national uniqueness, in contrast to her father, who asks a lot of questions about Ukraine, although he knows nothing about it either:

> Він зараз же почав мене питати, хто я, якої нації, чи давно в Парижі. Він також не знав, що то таке українці, але віднісся до того не так, як дочка. Навпаки, дуже зацікавився, присунув до мене свій стілець і з таким виглядом, немов мав почути від мене надзвичайні речі, став дивитись мені в лице. Це мене зворушило й зразу віддало в повну його владу. Уявіть собі: цей милий дідусь навіть про Олафа забув і так зацікавився новою нацією! Їй-богу, він міг мати повне право думати, що винайшов нас! Але як він ще далі віднісся до свого відкриття! Дізнавшись, що ми тільки-тільки вступаємо до культурного життя, що ми ще не зіпсовані "розпустою золота", як він підказав мені; дізнавшись, що нас тридцять мілійонів (якась кабалістична цифра в устах кожного українця!),—Вальдберг затурбувався, почав хапати мене за коліна і про щось найщиріше благати. Спочатку я навіть не зрозумів, що міг такого сказати чоловікові. Виявилось, що він боявся за нас! Він боявся за нашу молоду долю і прохав нас бути обережними—не кидатись на гній, уявляючи, що це дійсне золото... (632)
>
> He immediately began asking me who I was, what nationality and had I been in Paris long. He too did not know what Ukrainians were, but his attitude was different from his daughter's. On the contrary, he was very interested; he dragged his chair to me

> and began looking at my face as though he were about to hear some extraordinary things from me. This touched me and at once placed me under his full authority. Imagine: this gentle old man even forgot about Olaf and showed such interest in a new nation! Well, he had every right to think that he had discovered us! You should have seen his further attitude to his discovery! After he had learned that we are just now beginning to build our cultural life and that we were not yet corrupted by the "lechery of gold," as he put it; after he learned that there are thirty million of us (a cabalistic number for every Ukrainian!), Valdberg became concerned, began touching my knees and making urgent appeals. At first, I did not even understand what I had said to upset him. It turned out that he was concerned for us! He was concerned about our young fate and begged us to be careful—not to throw ourselves on manure, imagining that it is real gold…

This peculiarity of Europe's encounter with Ukraine as a *terra incognita* is also rendered through the way the narrator is addressed. Contrary to the other characters that have real names, he is simply called 'Ukren,' that is, according to the French pronunciation of 'Ukraine.'

Colonial prejudice was a problem that Vynnychenko encountered during his European exile. It was not always manifested openly; sometimes it was disguised in the exoticism of "the other." Vynnychenko's stay in Europe made him realize the subaltern status of his national representation not only within Russian imperial structures but also on the broader international scale. "…[I]t is difficult to be a Ukrainian writer. You carry your nationality like some kind of hereditary disease. It's impossible to get rid of it, as a blond can't become a brunette, but it's not easy to carry it" [...[Т]рудно бути українським літератором. Несеш як якусь наслідственну хворобу на собі свою національність. Скинути її—неможливо, як неможливо з блондина стати брюнетом, але ж і нести не легко] (22 December 1910). In this respect, he assumes that his national affiliation might be an obstacle to issuing his works in translation by a German publishing house in Munich, which had offered to publish them (28 March 1913).[39] Vynnychenko tries to inscribe a Ukrainian identity in the hostland, or as Gurr puts it, "to claim the universality of [exiles'] local experience" (22). In other words, displacement for colonized subjects always carries a sense of mission—political and cultural to represent their nations at the international arena (Baranczak). Vynnychenko articulates it in this way: "I want to glorify everything Ukrainian through me" [Я хочу возвеличити собою українське] (*Shchodennyk* 1: 214, 21 December 1916). In general, artistic Modernism was an international and cosmopolitan tendency and had little to do with nationalism in the West. In Eastern Europe, however, Modernism to a great extent determined the revival of many subjugated nations (Ilnytzkyj 1991).

In "Olaf Stefenzon," Vynnychenko continues to experiment. Although the story is mainly written in a realistic manner, there is an episode that betrays a non-realistic element in regard to the very content. This is an intriguing episode in which Mr. Valdberg offers his daughter as a prize for the best painting:

> Він призначив серед своїх учнів конкурс і дає половину грошей тому, хто заслужить першу премію. Але й цього не досить. Крім десяти тисяч марок, він мав ще єдину улюблену красуню дочку, от цю саму Емму. І цю дочку він дає тому, хто наблизиться в потрібній мірі до його ідеї. Згода дочки? Звичайно, не без її згоди. Вона понад все ставить батькове мистецтво і за його розвій може дати себе всю на що хочете. Умова така: вона обіцяє десять літ ні разу не зрадити чоловікові, дбати про його, служити йому, як рабиня. Чи чоловік кохатиме її, чи ні—це ролі не грає великої: десять літ вона служитиме, а тоді чи лишиться з чоловіком, чи піде від його (625).
>
> He has announced a competition among his students, and he is giving half of his money to the one who wins first prize. But there's more. Besides the 10,000 marks, he had an only daughter, the beautiful and beloved Emma. And he will give his

---

[39] Actually, there is no evidence that these translations were ever published.

> daughter to the one who will adequately approach his idea. Does he have the daughter's agreement? Certainly, nothing will happen without her consent. She reveres her father's art above everything, and for its development she is ready to give herself no matter what. This is the condition: she promises not to betray her husband even once during the ten years, to take care of him, and serve him like a slave. It does not matter very much whether her husband loves her or not: she will serve him for ten years and then either stay or leave him.

The language of this episode echoes a popular fairy tale motif, according to which a king offers half his kingdom and his daughter to the man who fulfills his wish. This motif is found in folklore throughout the world. Here are two examples from a different background:

> **"Askeladden and his Good Helpers" (Norwegian folk tale)**
>
> ...Once upon a time there was a king, and that king had heard a ship that could go on sea as fast as on land. A ship like that he wants too, and to that man who could build a ship like that, he promised his daughter and the half kingdom.
>
> (http://www.testmann.gs.nt.no/facts/nor05.htm)

> **"Cossack Mamaryha" (Ukrainian folk tale)**
>
> ...So the Cossack Mamaryha traveled until he came to a strange country. Here he heard from the people that there lived a king, and that before his palace grew a mighty oak tree, and that under this tree there lay untold treasure. The king had proclaimed that whoever would cut down this mighty oak, uproot it, and find the treasure, would have his daughter as his wife. But none who had tried so far were successful.
>
> Hearing this, the Cossack Mamaryha decided that he would give it a try. He rode up to the palace to announce his arrival and his willingness to cut down the oak. The king came out and asked: "Who are you?"
>
> "I am the Cossack Mamaryha," he replied, "and I will get the treasure from under the oak for you."
>
> "Very well," said the king. "If you cut down the tree and find the treasure, I will give half of my kingdom and the hand of my daughter in marriage. But if you haven't done it overnight, you'll lose your head in the morning."

(http://www.4to40.com/folktales/index.asp?article=folktales_cossackmamariha)

The attributes of folk narrative are evident in "Olaf Stefenzon": "half of his money" (parallels "half of the kingdom"), "the only beloved beautiful daughter," and Emma's consent to fulfill the extraordinary will of her father and be obedient to her husband for ten years. The marriage can continue if the conditions of the agreement are met. Does this episode with Emma-the-prize sound real in Vynnychenko's historical circumstances? Certainly not: its congruence with the overall realistic style of the story is problematic. This tendency may be motivated by what Peters calls "compensatory fantasies" (19). The critic continues: "Fantasy arises from the human condition of incompleteness" (37). A sense of incompleteness comes from the state of displacement and the lack of impressions. This prompts Vynnychenko to direct his attention from the physical world to the world of ideas, and he thus utilizes his "compensatory fantasies." Fantasies can also serve to better implement ideas and convince readers by alluding to traditional narratives.

"Olaf Stefenzon," unlike any of Vynnychenko's previous works, is an adventure, almost a detective story. Vynnychenko succeeds in maintaining suspense throughout: strangers on a street; unusual relationships among the members of Mr. Valdberg's circle; Emma's mysterious behaviour; attempts to spoil or destroy the paintings of both Pables and Stefenzon. In some sense, it can be called a detective story with an artistic theme, in which the narrator resembles a detective, who unravels a series of events leading to Olaf's sudden escape and Emma's depression. The story begins with a scene in which the narrator, walking along a Paris street one foggy evening, observes the extraordinary behaviour of a female passerby, who later turns out to be Emma:

> ...[П]ереходячи одну вулицю, я зупинився, бо десь попереду, як теля в загоні, жалісно ревів автомобіль. Поруч зі мною теж зупинилась якась дама. Вона чогось озиралась і ніби шукали очима позад себе... Дама, видно, нетерпеливилась, сердито постукуючи парасолем по тротуару. Я подивився на неї. В очі мені кинулись її дуже чорні, густі, змієсті брови, великі очі з чудним блиском і чіткий рисунок губ (613-14).

> …[C]rossing the street, I stopped because somewhere ahead a car was bellowing like a trapped calf. A lady stopped next to me. She was looked around for some reason, as if she had spotted something behind her… The lady seemed to be in a hurry, angrily thumping the ground with her umbrella. I looked at her. I immediately remarked her very black, heavy, and serpentine eyebrows, her large eyes, gleaming strangely, and the sharply etched shape of her lips.

He is also wary when he first meets Olaf Stefenzon on the street, immediately after his encounter with Emma. Replying to Olaf's request to tell him where she went, he says:

> Знаєте що, мій любий,... ви не хвилюйтесь, але адреси я вам дать не можу; ні вас, ні панни я не знаю; адресу можна сказать, чув незаконно; коли б панна знала, що ви мене знайдете, вона, певно б, не сказала при мені адреси, а тому і я не скажу її вам (618).

> You know what, my dear fellow…don't be upset, but I can't give you her address; I don't know either you or the lady; one may say that I heard the address illegally; if the lady had known that you would find me, she would probably never have mentioned her address to me, and that's why I won't give it to you.

Even after a reading of the story some episodes remain unclear and can lead to different interpretations. The folk motif definitely contributes to building a sense of adventure throughout the story. Actually, this was Vynnychenko's new artistic device, which served two purposes: 1) to entertain readers; and 2) to present his ideas in an entertaining fashion. In the general context of his writings during this period, "Olaf

Stefenson" can be viewed as an artistic experiment that seemed to puzzle readers with an unusual mixture of real and fictionalized planes.

This shift to non-reality in "Olaf Stefenson" led critics to accuse Vynnychenko for lowering his style and switching to sensational themes: "Whereas earlier every theme of his stories struck the reader's heart with its real truth, now the sensational theme strikes only one's nerves" ("Olaf Stefenzon" 1913, 313). The contemporary critic Pavlo Fedchenko calls the story an attempt "to fence himself off from real life" (1987, 55), a myopic approach in his estimation. The writer, in fact, gives quite a realistic picture of Bohemian life in Paris and presents his ideas on modernist art. Ostap Hrytsai positively reviewed the story, which "stimulates vivid interest on the part of readers" and called Vynnychenko "a great sensation" (qt. in Stel'mashenko, 118).[40]

Vynnychenko's next works of this period, such as *Po-svii* and *Bozhky* bring us back to his problematic themes of individuals struggling with revolutionary change. However, it is important to note that he will develop this experiment with non-realistic devices during his permanent exile in the 1920s in works, such as *Soniachna mashyna*, *Velykyi sekret* [The Big Secret] (1925), *Prorok*, calling his new style "symbolic realism."

2.3. The Émigré Writes Back

Although Vynnychenko was away from his homeland during 1907-14, he made it the main focus of attention by becoming actively involved in the cultural and literary life of Ukraine: he did so by contributing to intellectual discussions, broaching such issues as revolution, family relationships, love, truth, prostitution, and human instincts. It is striking that this writer, who resided abroad, became Ukraine's most acclaimed author. Although his radical, modernist ideas were widely criticized, their provocative nature and freshness were factors that attracted intelligentsia readers with their new horizon of expectation. In this section I emphasize Vynnychenko's national preoccupation and sense of Ukraine as a "familiar territory" that generated his assiduous interest in his native country and became his main literary focus. Then I examine how displacement leads to a shift from "real life" and "real people" to the more abstract and intellectually strained world of ideas in his works, his critical perspective on his homeland, and his provocative way of writing and communicating with the public from a distance.

---

[40] Stel'mashenko refers to Hrytsai, Ostap. "Z nashykh zhurnaliv." *Dilo* [L'viv] 7 (8 April 1913): 1-2. [From Our Journals]

Before examining Vynnychenko's émigré preoccupation with his homeland, I will survey his literary achievements in this period. Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi, his prominent contemporary, observed in a letter to Vynnychenko in 1909: "Whom do our people read? Vynnychenko. Whom do people talk about if it concerns literature? About Vynnychenko. Whom do they buy? Again Vynnychenko" ("Lystuvannia," 50). The writer's displacement during 1907-14 appears to have been enormously beneficial to his creativity. In a diary entry for 19 September 1910, Chykalenko called him a 'highly productive' writer (1931). During this period Vynnychenko wrote about forty works, including stories, plays, and novels. For the purpose of comparison, it should be noted that during 1902-06 Vynnychenko wrote twenty works, mainly short stories, one play, and no novels. The majority of his works were published in Kyiv and L'viv, with Russian translations in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Most were written in Europe, although I do not exclude the possibility that Vynnychenko may have written some works during his brief, illegal trips to Ukraine. It has not been established with any certainty where these works were written. My reconstruction of these places is on the basis of his correspondence with Chykalenko and other sources:

Geneva: "Moment" "Dym" [Smoke] "Rabyni spravzhn'oho" [Slaves of the Genuine], "Zina" [Zina], "Matvii Bezodnia" [Matvii Bezodnia] (1907-08).[41]

Capri: "Te zh same" [The Same] (1908).[42]

Zurich: "Zapysna knyzhka" [The Note Book] (1909).

Paris: *Memento*, *Bazar* (1909), *Brekhnia*, "Chudnyi epizod" (1910), *Rivnovaha* (1911), "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk," *Natus'* [Natus'] (1912), *Zapovit bat'kiv* [Testament of Forefathers] (1914).[43]

L'viv: *Chesnist' z soboiu* (started in Paris), *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, *Moloda krov* (1910)

During 1908-1913 over 200 critical works appeared with references to Vynnychenko's writings, including Ukrainian, Russian, German, and Polish sources.[44]

His dramaturgy, along with the plays of Lesia Ukrainka, Oleksandr Oles' and Spyrydon Cherkasenko, symbolized the rupture with traditional Ukrainian drama based on folkloric motifs (e.g., plays by Ivan Karpenko-Karyi, Marko Kropyvnyts'kyi, and Mykhailo Staryts'kyi) and the creation of a new modernist theatre. The staging of Vynnychenko's plays, however, encountered problems both because of censorship restrictions and challenges that they brought to the traditional theatre and audience expectations. A number of plays were banned by the Tsarist censors not only because they were about revolutionaries (e.g., *Bazar*)[45] but also because they touched upon moral issues that seemed too revolutionary (e.g., *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*). *Brekhnia*, however, was not prohibited and had quite a mixed reception. As one reviewer noted, its premiere in Kyiv was successful but the actors' performance was too poor to render all the nuances of the writer's ideas ("Artystychni," 7).

---

[41] "*Matvii Bezodnia*" is not extant; it is possible that Vynnychenko destroyed it. The writer mentioned this idea in his letter to Chykalenko from 7 July 1907.

[42] This story was published under the title "Shchos' bil'she za nas" [Something Greater than Us].

[43] *Zapovit bat'kiv* was first published in Russian in 1914.

[44] Stel'mashenko mentions 184 references to Ukrainian sources (92-122), 24 to Russian (475-80), two to German (460) and one to a Polish one (477). There was one reference to a Czech source dated 1907 (ibid., 537).

Through his connections with the Russian intelligentsia, thirty-six Russian-language publications of Vynnychenko's works appeared, including a collection of his works in separate volumes.[46] He was highly acclaimed by imperial audiences, and in some respects his writings echoed the traditions of Russian writers, such as Dostoyevsky, Gorky, Kuprin, and Artsybashev. The critic Konstantin Arabazhin, comparing Vynnychenko's works with those of Artsybashev (e.g., *Sanin*), singled out the Ukrainian writer's international appeal and the greater sophistication and philosophical underpinnings of his works (Stel'mashenko, 477).[47] His plays would be widely staged in cities throughout the Russian Empire during 1914-17: *Brekhnia* in the Alexandrinsky Theatre in St. Petersburg, in the Nezlobin theatre in Moscow, and in Odesa (director: Sibiriakov); *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid*,' *Mokhnonohe* and *Pryhvozhdeni* in Saratov (*Shchodennyk* 1: 222; Stel'mashenko, 476; 486). Vynnychenko also contributed his critical articles to the discussion about Ukrainian-Russian relations and Ukrainian identity in the Russian Empire ("Otkrytoie pis'mo k russkim pisateliam" [Open letter to Russian Writers], 1913).

---

[45] *Bazar*, however, was staged in L'viv, Chernivtsi, and Kolomyia (Ukrainian cities in Austro-Hungary). "Big ovations in Chernivtsi," Vynnychenko noted in his letter to Chykalenko (4 April 1912).

[46] Five volumes appeared before 1914 and the other four by 1917 (Stel'mashenko, 67-70).

[47] Stel'mashenko was referring to Arabazhin, K. I. *Etiudy o russkikh pisateliakh* [Etudes on Russian Writers]. St. Petersburg: Prometei, 1912.

Vynnychenko constantly drew the attention of the press. From time to time the newspaper *Rada* (Kyiv, 1909-1914) and other periodicals published brief notes about the writer's whereabouts and what he was working on, even though he was officially wanted by the police in Ukraine. It seems that the writer reacted to any information that concerned him personally or his ideas. In this respect, his numerous letters to such periodicals as *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* (L'viv, in 1907 the journal moved to Kyiv), *Ukrains'ka khata* (Kyiv), *Nash holos* [Our Voice] (L'viv), *Dilo* [Cause] (L'viv), *Rada* (Kyiv), *Dzvin* (Kyiv), and *Ukrainskaia zhizn'* (Moscow) are very significant. This phenomenon of being physically victimized but culturally present (in the form of literary works and plays) is what distinguishes Russian imperial rule from the Soviet regime (upon Stalin's consolidation of state power in the 1930s), which put a ban on all Vynnychenko's works. In other words, during the period 1907-14 the writer was physically absent from his homeland, yet his "persona" and works were not in displacement; they were present and played a significant role in Ukrainian cultural production. His long stay abroad did not limit his creative zeal. On the contrary, despite many inconveniences he became more productive and versatile.

Next I will examine how displacement informed Vynnychenko's attitude toward his homeland. Theory tells us that it is natural for a displaced writer to look back at the beginning of his displacement, especially for an émigré with an active political attitude toward processes unfolding in the homeland and a strong desire to return. As White points out: "...[I]t must be noted that amongst all the literature of migration the highest proportion deals in some way with ideas of return, whether actualised or remaining imaginary" (14). Although Vynnychenko can be considered a traveler and a displaced modernist writer who enjoys his stay abroad, his émigré status prevailed at this period and was best exemplified by his extensive involvement in the Ukrainian cultural discourse. We use the term "émigré" here to emphasize his active attitude, both in cultural and political terms, toward his homeland. Despite Vynnychenko's connections with the diaspora and foreign artistic circles, his main audience remained in Ukraine. The country was rapidly undergoing cardinal changes, and Vynnychenko felt responsible and dedicated to its fate. In a letter to Chykalenko from Geneva, dated 21 January 1908, he describes his national position:

> Будьте певні, Євгене Харлампійовичу, що поки я почуваю в собі сили, я постараюсь зробити все, щоб прислу́житись нашій національній справі. Всякими путями, всякими способами, а ми мусимо стати нарівні з передовими націями. Це мета, для якої варто жити й працювати.
>
> You can be sure, Ievhen Kharlampiiovych, that as long as I feel able, I will do my best to serve our national cause. By all ways and all means we must keep up with the developed nations. This is the goal for which it is worth living and working.

There is an opinion that a displaced writer becomes more national when he lives outside the homeland (Fizer, xxiv). For instance, the fact that American expatriate writers who stayed in Europe after World War I understood their national identity more deeply was the subject of numerous studies (Cowley, Earnest, Ross, and Washington). This is not necessarily true of all writers, especially those who left their homeland at a young age (compare this to Nabokov's prose works, none of which were set in his homeland, Russia, barring the odd allusion).[48] For Vynnychenko, distance gave him crucial reinforcement and sharpened his focus and active engagement in processes in the home country. This active engagement can be inspired by what Maria-Ines Lagos-Pope calls "literary responses to the political repression" (123). For Tucker, displacement creates "a wound that shoot its own arrows of artistic strength and stimulation" (xx). Certainly, being a revolutionary activist and a member of a political party, Vynnychenko considered his literary activity a part of his political agenda to transform society on different levels.

---

[48] Besides the fact that Nabokov, who studied English and French in his childhood, was younger when he left his country, there was also a weaker sense of his national preoccupation, since Russia, unlike Ukraine, was an independent state.

Crucial to a writer's preoccupation with his homeland there is the factor that Seidel calls "familiar territory:" "...[T]he exilic mind, no matter where it projects, no matter how unknown its arts, emanates from familiar or local territory. Imaginative powers begin at the boundaries of accumulated experience" (2). It is natural for a displaced writer to write about what s/he knows better. That is why, in his opinion, displaced writers, such as Conrad or Naipaul, wrote so little about Britain, where they migrated. For instance, virtually all of Conrad's characters are travelers, foreigners, or exiles. This "familiar territory" can be reached through artistic sensitivity, an important characteristic that determines the writer's decision to write about what is familiar and engrained in his soul. In Gurr's opinion, exiles who write about the hostland risk losing artistic sensitivity and thus these works cannot compete with those written from homeland experience: "All the work of such exiles, Joyce, Mansfield, Naipaul, is markedly weaker when the creative effort has to be directed towards the construction of a foreign environment or tradition" (26). Significantly, out of approximately forty works written during this period only four works (i.e., "Taina," *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, "Olaf Stefenzon," and *Rivnovaha*) have a deliberate hostland setting, whereas his other works are set in Ukraine and depict familiar realia for the readership (although mostly with a very vague and conventional setting). Tellingly, even in those four works

Vynnychenko says little about the local space but deals predominantly with the life of émigrés.

However, in time, the vision of "familiar territory" moves from immediate impressions and realistic observations to the more abstract world of ideas. In his letter to Chykalenko, dated 5 February 1910, Vynnychenko speaks about this transformation: "My entire misfortune is that I recollect life, I don't see it around [me], I don't see real people, but my ideas are always with me. That's why there is an advantage of ideas over images" [Все моє нещастя в тому, що я згадую життя, я не бачу його навколо себе, я не бачу живих людей, але мої ідеї завжди зі мною. Ось чому ідеї переважають над образами]. The writer confesses that geographical displacement impedes observations of everyday life.

This statement, however, may be illusive and serve as proof that his complaint betrays his literary crisis. For instance, Moroz, in referring to the above citation, assumes that Vynnychenko sometimes "lacked the ability to prove his rightness—to prove in an artistic way and through characters that are bright, understandable, and attractive to the audience" (137). Certainly, there were defects in his works. But the point is that displacement forced him to deploy a new narrative strategy based on recollections and elaborations of ideas. This citation is a very important clue for understanding the shift in Vynnychenko's literary career from a realistic depiction of everyday life (with a focus on social issues) to philosophical reflections and intellectual analyses of problematic moral issues. It is also important to emphasize here that his retreat from realistic observations in no way means a lessening of his interest in his homeland. Although his physical break with his country and its social and psychological consequences may be perceived in negative terms, in terms of literary development it impacted the writer positively. At this point his literary expression took a more philosophical form, and his ideas were initially addressed to the Ukrainian audience. While some of Vynnychenko's early works were overburdened with national tonality,[49] now they acquired more visible universal value, as they shared a common modernist interest in the complexity of human nature. In general, strictly modernist concerns begin to stimulate ideas, driving the narrative and replacing naturalistic representation. In this sense, Vynnychenko was always a man of ideas. But displacement, on its part, with its geographical distance and lack of immediate impressions from the homeland, made those ideas more intense and dominant in Vynnychenko's handling of literary material. Panchenko observes this writer's shift to immense intellectual tension and philosophical values, which he attributed to Vynnychenko's gradual loss of political influence and acquisition of the voice of an artist and thinker (http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p2.shtml#2.2.%20).

Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari explain the phenomenon of philosophical preoccupation of another modernist writer, Franz Kafka, by what they call "deterritorialization," the loss or absence of a writer's natural territory, and social and cultural milieu. They particularly emphasize that Kafka was a Jew who lived among Czechs and wrote in German, whose population and language were limited to Czech territory (16). On this basis critics include him in the ranks of writers of "minor literature." Considering 'deterritorialization' synonymous with displacement (as well as "territory" and "place"), we can draw a parallel between the two writers to support our argument, although their displacements have clearly different characteristics.

---

[49] Lesia Ukrainka in her article "Vynnychenko" indicated, in particular, the writer's low and rough humour in the stories "Narodnyii diiach" [The People's Activist] (1903) and "Zaruchyny" [The Engagement] (1904).

Being displaced from his natural social and cultural milieu, Vynnychenko spoke about the loss of live contacts and the lack of impressions from Ukraine, which were gradually disappearing. He even asked Chykalenko to narrate episodes about everyday life or to send letters from *Rada*'s correspondents so that he could refresh his own memory and use them as literary material:

> Ах, шкода—шкода, що я не можу бути дома. Я напружую всі нерви, майже галлюцинації викликаю, щоб бачити й уявити те, що мені треба, але ніяка фантазія не утворить того, що може дать одна дрібничка, утворена життям, на улиці, на лиці, в слові живої людини. От так мушу сидіти в цих туманах, серед чужих, нецікавих, непотрібних мені людей і тратити сили на те, що так легко взяти дома. Може б Ви мені написали також про деяких людей видатних чим-небудь в українському русі, інтересних для романа (29 November 1912).

> Ah, what a pity it is that I can't be at home. I strain every nerve and almost conjure up hallucinations to see and imagine what I need. But no fantasy can create what a simple thing created by life, on a street, a face, and in a word of a living person can give. So I have to remain among these fogs, among these strange, uninteresting people, who are useless to me and expend my energy on what is so easily available at home. Perhaps you could write to me about certain people who are prominent in some ways in the Ukrainian movement and interesting for the novel.

A year later Vynnychenko expresses the same thought after finishing a new novel:[50]

> На підставі кількох незначних рис треба було відбудовувати ситуацію, характери. Коли б я був дома, не треба було б гаяти час на те, що готове під руками. І доки ж так буде? Чи довго я зможу так писати? Цікаво самому, що буде далі (11 December 1913).

> I had to re-create the situation and characters on the basis of a few insignificant details. If I were at home, I would not have to spend time on what is at hand. And how

---

[50] The writer does not mention the title of the work. It could be most likely *Bozhky*.

> long will this continue? How long can I keep on writing like this? I myself am interested to see what will happen later.

A lack of fresh impressions of his homeland is what concerns him most: "…[I]f it's going to be like this for at least another three years, I won't be able to write a word about Ukrainian life, let alone general Russian life. This is what torments me most!" [...[K]оли так і буде ще хоч з три роки, я вже й слова не зможу написати не те що з українського, а й з загальноросійського життя. От що більш усього мучить!] (11 December 1913).[51]

Critics observed this shift in Vynnychenko's works based on his vivid impressions of everyday life to the more intellectual stance of works of ideas. Mykola Ievshan, for instance, says:

> Vynnychenko's new direction is not spontaneous but [that of an] intellectual, who 'lectures' readers and proposes a new morality… He began to produce plays *a la* Ibsen, which are limited to a small group of people… Vynnychenko became a man of letters [literat], who professionally works out his themes and who does not take from real life but imitates European writers… A strange force hangs over the whole artistic world of the author. He is torn from the reality of life and he studies, not creates (1998c, 574-5).

On the other hand, these constructed ideas introduced a sense of artificiality to his writings. Some critics (Steshenko, Kostiuk) criticize Vynnychenko for the improbability of his characters, as if they were constructed to support the writer's ideas.

---

[51] Interestingly, Joyce also asked his brother Stanislaus and his friends to send him very detailed information about Dublin. Working on *Ulysses* in 1921, he asked his Aunt Josephine the following: "Two more questions. Is it possible for an ordinary person to climb over the area railings of no 7 Eccles street, either from the path or the steps, lower himself from the lowest part of the railings till his feet are within 2 feet or 3 of the ground and drop unhurt. I saw it done myself but by a man of rather athletic build. I require this information in detail in order to determine the wording of a paragraph. Secondly. Do you know anything of Mat Dillon's daughter Mamy who was in Spain? If so, please let me know. Did any of your girlfriends ever go there? Thirdly and last. Do you remember the cold February of 1893. I think you were in Clanbrassil street. I want to know whether the canal was frozen and if there was any skating" (qt. in Beja, 65).

"Vynnychenko's plays and prose works after 1907 sometimes lacked persuasive artistic and psychological motivation, even though they aptly portrayed true characters of that epoch and the chaos of the search for ideas that were swirling among the youth" (Kostiuk 1980a, 170). The reviewer in *Rada* (1 (14 January 1911): 5) commented on the character of Myron Kupchenko from *Chesnist' z soboiu*: "[…] he is not a 'hero of our time' at all but the fruit of the writer's fantasy" ("Novi," 5).

In a letter to Chykalenko Vynnychenko justifies his literary experiments: "I didn't make up any of my works; I personally experienced them all to various extents" [Ні один свій твір я не видумав, кожний я так чи інакше пережив, в кожному я в житті приймав більшу чи меншу участь] (16 April 1909). It seems that the writer and his critics understood his work in different ways. Critics wanted to see the writer as they had seen him during his first period, as a pure observer of "real" life. For Vynnychenko, his works embraced everything that appealed to his own experience either in terms of everyday life or ideas. This ideological "non-reality," in fact, became his "new reality," and was probably even more important, as it fostered greater intellectual strength and contributed to the writer's broader international appeal. The only problem, as Vynnychenko saw it, was to find an appropriate artistic form to embody these ideas: "Two-three more attempts but I must learn how to create plays from philosophical treatises... Hauptman, Ibsen also take an idea and transform it into actions and images" [Хай ще дві-три проби, але мушу ж я схопити те, що із філософських трактатів робить п'єси. Гауптман, Ібсен теж беруть ідею і воплощають її в дію й образи] (5 November 1910).

By comparison, returning home illegally in 1909, Vynnychenko planned to write stories the way he did before his emigration: "Don't be scared regarding my travel. This is the kind of travel that may produce something like "Holota" [The Needy] and "Holod" [Hunger] etc. I can't help doing it. I've become rusty. My old impressions have become mouldy and thickened. I can't stand the quiet, it annoys me terribly" [Щодо подорожи моєї, то не бійтесь за неї. Це таки подорож, яка може дать що-небудь вроді "Голоти," "Голода"[52] і т.п. Не робити її—не можу. Закис я. Старі враження поцвіли, загускли. Не виношу спокою, страшенно надокучає] (16 April 1909). This admission, in fact, highlights a crucial tendency in Vynnychenko's writings in displacement: realistic and impressionistic narratives about everyday life were closely connected with his presence in Ukraine, whereas the rupture of his connection to Ukraine contributed to his detachment, new works of 'ideas,' and philosophical reflections on himself and his society. However, not all critics saw this distinction clearly. Panchenko, for instance, writes:

> Vynnychenko, torn by forced emigration from his native ground, from the spontaneity of the life that he had left behind, felt with a specific acuteness the lack of spontaneous impressions and observations. As a creative person he had always had a strong capacity for spontaneous short story depiction, a skill in the wake of recent events to recreate "a piece of life" through words, with its paradoxes, urgent socio-psychological and moral collisions, with its vivid material, the objective world of things, distinctness of characters, and daring penetration into "prohibited" zones (http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p7.shtml#3.4).

The critic seems to have overlooked the point that "urgent socio-psychological and moral collisions" and "daring penetration into 'prohibited' zones" became dominant later, during Vynnychenko's emigration in 1907-14, and that, to a great extent, they became possible at the cost of "the lack of spontaneous impressions and observations."

---

[52] These stories were published in 1905 and 1907, respectively.

Having moved to the abstract world of ideas, Vynnychenko found himself simultaneously detached and with a new perspective on his country. Why is this important and is there a limitation on such a perspective? Here we follow the theoretical premises stated above (p. 37-40) that movement leads to transformation of the self and helps the writer acquire a fresh perspective on things, which seem to be ordinary and familiar at home. Speaking in terms of pilgrimage, Dalby and Wallace B. Clift say:

> It seems that one needs to get away from one's routine sometimes in order to get perspective on it. When one is caught in a sense of sameness where nothing happens, one may be drawn to go on pilgrimage. It can also be out of boredom with the home place and a longing for transformation, although without necessarily having a conscious awareness of that need (54).

Being detached from normal everyday life, the writer was inclined to self-analysis and self-reflection. "[I]n exile,—Randolph Pope writes—the worst danger is stagnation and loss of self, the worst pains, loneliness, ineffectiveness, and dread. The answer to these dangers and sufferings can be found in the continued transformation of the self" (80). Significantly in this respect is the fact that at this time Vynnychenko began keeping a diary. Kostiuk, who thoroughly examined the writer's archive, stated in "Zapysnyky Volodymyra Vynnychenka" [Notebooks of Volodymyr Vynnychenko] that his first diary entry was made on 1 February 1911 (1980b, 11). The forty-volume diary is a unique document that Vynnychenko kept systematically until his death. In one of his entries the writer defines the purpose of his diary:

> Я рішив, як не щодня, то якомога частіше вести щоденник. Це сприяє самоаналізі й самоорганізації, примушує зупинятись над собою і перевіряти.

> Крім того, ще є та увага, те зупинняння над життям, якого так треба для щастя. Розум, здатний зупиняти себе й усю істоту над ментами життя, прислухатись до них, вслухуватись, освітлювати їх, як з ручного електричного ліхтаря, пучком світла,—такий розум є великий помічник щастя (*Shchodennyk* 1: 118-19, 15 November 1914).

> I decided to keep a diary if not every day, then as often as possible. It fosters self-analysis and self-organization and forces me to focus and examine myself. Besides, it means that attention, that focus on life, which is so necessary for happiness. The mind that is able to stop itself and one's whole human being at moments of life, listen to them, observe them, and illuminate them, as though with an electric lantern, such a mind is a big aid to happiness.

As a parallel, in *Po-svii* the main protagonist, Vadym Stel'mashenko, who is living in Siberian exile, also keeps a diary, which occupies a substantial part of the novel. He records notes that reflect on the collective and individual aspects of the revolution:

> Ми революціонери, соціялісти, жертвуємо спокоєм, молодістю, всім життям за ідею справедливости, за бажання помогти ображеним і знедоленим, ми такі гуманні з людськістю, чому ми такі жорстокі з одиницями, чому ми байдужі до щастя, навіть не щастя, та невеличкої, скромної радости найближчих своїх товаришів? Невже то правда, що щастя людськости буде куплено стражданням людей? (135).

> We, revolutionaries, socialists, sacrifice peace, youth, and all of life for the idea of justice, for the desire to help abused and downtrodden people. We are so humane to humankind, why are we so cruel with individuals, why are we indifferent to happiness, not even happiness, but the small, modest happiness of our closest friends? Is it true then that human happiness will be redeemed through people's suffering?

on love and respect:

> Чому любов, пошану ми даємо тим, хто й так уже має багато,—гарним, розумним, здоровим і через те щасливим? І через що ми караємо тих, які й так покарані,—негарних, нерозумних, недужих, нещасливих? (ibid.).

> Why do we give love and respect to those who already have enough—to nice, intelligent, and healthy and thus happy people? And why do we punish those who have already been punished—not nice, stupid, weak, and unhappy?

and on his own inner struggle:

> ...[З] собою далеко трудніше погодитись, ніж з ким іншим... Але чого я хочу, зрештою? Робити те, що мені неприємно? Та це ж цілком природно, що всяка жива істота для піддержки свого існування мусить вишукувати корисне й приємне для себе. Коли б було навпаки, коли б її тягнуло до шкідливого й неприємного, то всі б індивіди повимирали й зникла та сама людськість… (ibid., 137-38).

> …[I]t is far more difficult to cope with oneself than anyone else … But what do I want, after all? To do what is unpleasant for me? It is completely natural that every living being to sustain his existence has to look for beneficial and pleasant things. If it were the contrary, if everyone were drawn to harmful and unpleasant things, then every individual would have died out, and all humankind would have disappeared…

This kind of self-reflection is also present in his next novel, *Bozhky*, which can be considered a sequel to *Po-svii*.

One of Vynnychenko's most confessional works was his article "Pro moral' panuiuchykh i moral' pryhnoblenykh" (published in *Nash holos*, 1911), a response to the criticism of his first novel, *Chesnist' z soboiu*. The article is a striking document in which the writer reveals his disillusionment in revolution and analyzes himself in that context. At first a romantic revolutionary, Vynnychenko had now become disillusioned with real revolutionary practice and had come to the conclusion that revolutionaries were not ideal but ordinary men, who may also be prone to natural human traits, such as egoism, envy, and animosity. The main idea of Vynnychenko's message was to justify his concept of "honesty with oneself" as a fundamental principle that revolutionaries must follow in order to succeed:

> Ідея "чесности з собою" зародилась в мені... давно. Ще в той час, коли мені кожний, хто звав себе революціонером, уявляв ся героєм, коли душа була піднесена до зразків Радіщева, Перовської,—вже тоді я почав помічати якусь дізгармонію між оточуючим мене реальним життям і образами утвореними юнацькою фантазією.
>
> Я приглядав ся до сього життя, вдумував ся в учення соціялізму, але чим більше я робив се, тим яскравіше ставала перед моїми очима ся дізгармонія (420).

> The idea of 'honesty with oneself' occurred to me… a long time ago. Even in the days when I imagined that everyone who called himself a revolutionary was a hero, when my soul was exalted by examples of Radishchev and Perovs'ka, even then I was beginning to notice disharmony between the real life around me and images created by youthful flight of imagination.
>
> I observed this life and I delved into the study of socialism. But the more I did so, the more explicit this disharmony appeared before my eyes.

The writer is sincere enough to expose his own experience as a "progressive man." Following his moral principle of "honesty with oneself," he speaks provocatively about his visits to brothels, drinking, and lying to friends, and inserts his personal life in his narrative strategy:

> Передусім я помічав сю дізгармонію в самім собі. Я вважав себе за поступову людину, за члена соціялістичної організації, я щиро й гаряче протестував проти соціяльної неправди, в імени сього протесту йшов до тюрми, готовий був іти на смерть за перемогу своїх політичних і соціяльних переконань. В той час я написав вже кілька оповідань, в яких висловлював свій протест проти соціяльних несправедливостей. Критики знайшли в них і розуміння народної душі, й щире відношення до пригноблених, й "проповідь правди й свободи"...
>
> Але сам перед собою я знав, що мої оповідання, моя участь в партії, мої тюрми, мої натхненні проклямації—все се щире, все се в мені, я не брешу в усьому ні собі, ні иньшим, але... все се не те. В щоденним життю я жив не

> відповідно сьому. Я, наприклад, без огляду на свою віру в світле, чисте вчення соціялізму, почував себе моральним злочинцем,—я ходив до проститутоκ, любив іноді випити, доводилось ізза конспірації брехати своїм же товаришам, бути нечесним з найблизшими людьми, робити часто несправедливі й брутальні вчинки. Все се не відповідало взірцеві соціяліста, яко людини вищої моралі, героя й святого... Звісно, се мучило, змушувало змагатись з собою, змушувало ще пильніше приглядатись до сього оточення (420-21).

> First of all I noticed this disharmony in myself. I considered myself a progressive person, a member of a socialist organization. I sincerely and passionately protested against social injustice, for which I was imprisoned and was ready to die for the victory of my political and social convictions. At that time I wrote a number of stories, in which I expressed my protest against social injustice. Critics found in them an understanding of the people's soul, a sincere attitude toward oppressed people and a "sermon of truth and freedom"…
>
> But in private I knew that my stories, my participation in the party, my imprisonments, and my inspired proclamations—all that is sincere, all this is in me, I do not lie about anything either to myself or to others, but…all this is not the point. My everyday life did not correspond to this. For instance, despite my faith in the bright and pure study of socialism, I felt I was a moral criminal—I visited prostitutes, liked to drink sometimes, lied to my comrades because for conspiratorial reasons, was dishonest with people who were closest to me, and often committed unjust and brutal acts. All this did not correspond to the model of a socialist as a person of superior morals, as a hero and a saint… Naturally, this tormented me, forced me to compete with myself, compelled me to observe my milieu more vigilantly.

As a result, Vynnychenko's eyes were opened to the whole system of revolutionary ethics, which tried to hide all faults, considering them unimportant in contrast to the serious cause of the revolution:

> Але те, що почав я й тут помічати, не тільки не заспокоїло мене, а викликало ще більше недоуміння й роспач. Я побачив, що більшість моїх товаришів також не святі, що їх щоденне й навіть партійне життя не відповідало високим взірцям революціонерів попередніх часів... Багато товаришів говорили

> мені: "Так не можна писати про революціонерів, се шкодить партійній справі, се підкопує авторитет інтелігенції". Спочатку сі аргументи здавали ся мені переконуючими, але потім я побачив їх хибність, я побачив, що ховання своїх болячок ще більше пошкодить партійній справі, ніж сміливе, болюче виявленє й курування їх (421).

> And what I began noticing not only did not reassure me but caused even greater bewilderment and despair. I saw that most of my friends were not saints either and that their everyday and even party life did not correspond to the superior examples of past revolutionaries… Many comrades told me: 'You can't write about revolutionaries like this, it harms the party's cause and undermines the authority of the intelligentsia.' At first, these arguments seemed convincing to me. But later I saw their shortcomings; I saw that hiding our defects affects the party's cause even more than their painful discovery and cure.

It is natural that self-analysis is projected to what lies beyond the self—society at large, which is now seen from a perspective of distance generated by displacement. Many critics point to its creative and transformative role. According to Robinson, distance is what differentiates displaced writers from non-displaced ones and makes them unique: "[T]he most energetic exiles have the opportunity to see things from an unvisited perspective—to enjoy a degree of sensitivity and acuity unavailable to most non-exiles" (xvii). Distance gives a new context for old experience. It is not, as Theodor Adorno put it, "a safety zone but a field of tension" (qt. in Kaplan, 101).[53]

The perspective of distance, along with self-analysis (hence, the role of his diary and the introduction of diaries in his works) and a strong ideological focus were the factors that gave the writer new and fresh insight into various aspects of intellectual and cultural life of Ukrainian society. Revolutionary activity, the relativity of absolute truth, sex, love, and family relationships, and the so-called "paradoxes of life" attracted Vynnychenko with their "unvisited" perspective and became revolutionarily significant issues. These ideas were often neglected by traditionalists, who viewed society from the conservative perspective of homogeneity. Probably no other modernist writer, including Lesia Ukrainka, Kobylians'ka and Kotsiubyns'kyi attained such a degree of intellectual intensity and controversy as Vynnychenko. Although he implied a preference for a kind of "modest art" (e.g., "Olaf Stefenzon," 632), which linked him to the tradition of realism, this principle soon came into conflict with Vynnychenko's new stance during his emigration, which was often ostentatiously provocative and caused fierce debates. Now I will examine how these ideas were manifested in his works.

---

[53] Vynnychenko does not explicitly say that his stay abroad would lend him a new perspective as a writer. On the contrary, as is clear from his letters to Chykalenko cited above, he complains about his displacement, which impedes his normal literary work. In the same way, an exile writer does not simply accept his exile as a better place in which he can write. Contrary to expatriate or self-exiled writers (e.g., Hemingway, Joyce), Vynnychenko's displacement gave him rather an 'involuntary' perspective with its intensive intellectual work, which he willy-nilly transformed to his advantage.

The corruption of revolutionary ideals and morals was at the forefront of Vynnychenko's criticism, as he himself painfully experienced the defeat of the 1905-07 revolution. No social changes could alter society unless there is a revolution in people's minds and within individual relationships. In his play *Bazar* Vynnychenko depicts a group of revolutionaries who are working for the same cause. But it soon becomes clear that some of them (Leonid, Trokhym) are attracted to their activities because of the beauty of their colleague Marusia. To solve the problem she scars her face with a chemical. With such works as *Bazar*, Vynnychenko undermined the traditional understanding of a group as more or less ideal and homogeneous and revealed natural contradictions within it. Life is not only what it seems; much more is hidden in the human subconsciousness. It is more chaotic or, as the protagonist Tsinnist' Markovych observes, "Life, my dear, is a bazaar" [Життя, любчику, базар] (91). Vynnychenko did not portray revolutionaries as heroes or ideals to follow, but as ordinary people with all their instincts and egotistical drives that govern human behaviour in many ways. His criticism of revolutionaries violated the ideological restrictions articulated by the party activists, about which the writer complained in "Pro moral' panuiuchykh i moral' pryhnoblenykh" (421). In a letter to Vynnychenko (4 April 1909, Capri), Gorky articulated this position with regard to *Bazar*:

> Let us assume that not long ago both the social democrat Veresaev and the socialist revolutionary Savinkov have been stripping the Russian revolutionary of his romantic and ideal garments. But I can't consider their argument with Russian history a victory for them—I can't!... Your revolutionaries are not socialists—do you see?... Generally speaking, I probably don't understand your play. And that is why I will refrain from discussing it further. I don't want you to align with Veresaev,[54] Savinkov[55] and other liquidators of the revolution. I will allow myself to look at your work as your misunderstanding and error (2001, 7: 116-117).

Vynnychenko managed to avoid the dilemma of whether he ought to criticize revolutionaries, even if it might affect the revolutionary cause. Truth matters above all. Thus, his vivisection of the revolutionary movement became a real revelation, which helps us to understand this important event at the beginning of the twentieth century and Vynnychenko's success as a writer.

In Vynnychenko's opinion, the revolution's exclusively political aspect would not lead to cardinal changes in society but would, in fact, result in a simple rotation of power. Vadym Stel'mashenko in *Bozhky* articulates the writer's disillusionment:

> Ми, соціалісти, хто—ми? Ми жерці цих самих божків. Ми не такі одгодовані, ліниві й брехливі, як ті, проти кого ми воюємо. Ми—худі, фанатичні

---

[54] Vikentii Veresaev (1867-1945) was a Russian writer imbued with revolutionary ideas. After 1907 he came to reject revolutionary changes through violence.

[55] Boris Savinkov (1879-1925) was an active member of the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries and the author of a number of literary works.

> аскети, ми пустельники, що йдемо на жерців пишних храмів, де стоять божки. Ми йдемо проти них за те, що вони брехливо, недбало й егоїстично дбають про божків, ми обурені на них за те, що вони підривають у нас віру в святість божків з одбитими носами, в вічність скрижалів. Ми хочемо вигнати одгодованих жерців, щоб їхнє місце заняли худі аскети, щоб авторітет божків високо піднявся діяльністю, щирістю, самовіданістю вірних переконаних служителів. Але самі божки, самі скрижалі, незмінні, вічні, єдині, закам'янілі—мусять лишитися. Так само божки люблять жертви. Але що щиріші, діяльніші, більш віддані жерці, то більше мусить бути жертв, більше справжньої крови (156).

> We, socialists, who are we? We are priests of these small gods. We are not as fat, lazy, and mendacious as those whom we are fighting. We are skinny and fanatic ascetics; we are hermits who fight the priests of luxurious temples where the small gods stand. We fight them because they mendaciously, inaccurately, and egotistically take care of the small gods; we are offended that they undermine our beliefs in the holiness of the small gods with their chipped noses, in the eternity of the commandments. We want to drive out the fat priests, so that the skinny ascetics can take their places, so that the authority of the small gods will increase through the activity, sincerity, and self-sacrifice of their devoted and believing servants. But the small gods and the commandments themselves must remain unchangeable, eternal, unique, and cast in stone. The small gods also like sacrifices. But the more sincere and devoted the priests, the more sacrifices and true blood must there be.

Significantly, *Bozhky* appeared to be a prophetic work that anticipated the transformation of self-sacrificing revolutionaries into the most brutal tyrants that clung to power after Lenin's revolution of 1917.[56]

Not only revolutionary events but also other "paradoxes of life" attracted Vynnychenko. Following Bergsonian intuitivism, the writer sought the mysteries of life and its extraordinary manifestations—something that is hidden from explicit perception. What is truth? Are moral principles unchangeable in bourgeois society? As a Marxist, Vynnychenko embraces the relativity of this principle. The most significant work in this respect is his play *Brekhnia* (1910), theatrically the most successful of Vynnychenko's plays. In order to preserve her family, Natalia Pavlivna is engaged in a balancing act between her ailing husband, the engineer Andrii Karpovyh, and her lover, the young poet Tos,' who wants Natalia Pavlivna to leave her husband. The lie becomes the truth that justifies her personal motives and behaviour until a third man, Ivan Stratonovych, learns about her life and blackmails Natalia Pavlivna into becoming his lover. This manipulation of the "truth" leads to a tragic end, i.e., Natalia Pavlivna's suicide. Unlike traditional narratives with simple plots and folk clichés (works by Nechui-Levyts'kyi, Panas Myrnyi, and Karpenko-Karyi), works like *Brekhnia* introduced new dimensions into the Ukrainian literary discourse. They reveal human nature in all its complexity. Psychological phenomena are multi-dimensional, with characters constantly struggling with their own contradictory personas.

---

[56] There are numerous references to Vynnychenko as a prophet in Ukrainian literary discourse (Taniuk, Syvachenko). Syvachenko, for instance, included the word 'prophet' in the title of her recent monograph on Vynnychenko, *Prorok ne svoieii Vitchyzny. Ekspatriants'kyi 'metaroman' Volodymyra Vynnychenka: tekst i kontekst* (2003).

No Ukrainian writer elaborated so much on sexual and erotic themes at the beginning of the twentieth century as Vynnychenko. His new man appears to be totally emancipated within the modernist discourse. He shows sexual desire as a natural instinct that bourgeois morality tries to avoid or restrict. Sexual freedom is now considered a matter of personal choice. His works feature the emotionally sensitive images of Dara (*Chesnist' z soboiu*), Snizhynka (*Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*) and Mary (*Rivnovaha*). To challenge herself, Dara goes to a hotel and asks a porter to find a young man for a sexual affair. Although placing herself in man's shoes is a real challenge for a patriarchal society, the most important thing is her individual victory over herself. She could do whatever she wanted and nobody could stop her. After this advanture Dara decides to leave her husband to live with Myron, a man whom she really loves.[57] Although the couple feels alone and isolated from society, they are confident in their own way of life, which is also the way of the new people. In contrast, Vira Kysel's'ka and Taras Shcherbyna, who cannot reconcile their sexual desires with moral customs have a nervous breakdown and eventually die. For Vynnychenko this was a problem of honesty with oneself and the hypocrisy of bourgeois society.

Within the theme of sexual and love relationships, Vynnychenko also addresses the issue of prostitution as a social and moral problem. His own visits to brothels, about which he intimated in "Pro moral' panuiuchykh i moral' pryhnoblenykh," likely served as a basis for his novel *Zapovit bat'kiv*. The main protagonist, Petro Zabolot'ko, a doctor who specializes in venereal diseases, explains the phenomenon of prostitution as the result of the conflict between human nature and society. If it is impossible to abolish prostitution, then society must recognize it simply as a profession and not denigrate prostitutes. For Vynnychenko the problem of prostitution was always a litmus test for the true, evolved revolutionary. Zabolot'ko, who represents the authorial voice, says: "Revolutionaries? Destroyers of the old? But what can you destroy if you firmly defend the cement that binds together all the stones of an old building—its morality?" [Революціонери? Руїнники старого? Та що ж ви можете зруйнувати, коли ви цупко бороните той цемент, що в'яже все каміння старої будови—мораль її?] (158). He continues: "If you want to test a so-called 'progressive person'—address the issue of prostitution, love, marriage, and family" [Хочеш перевірити так звану "поступову людину"—зачепи з нею питання проституції, кохання, шлюбу, родини] (160). Ironically, Zabolot'ko is falsely charged with propagandizing prostitution and sentenced to three years' imprisonment; he is accompanied by his wife Tonia, a former prostitute whom he cured from her venereal disease. As in *Bozhky*, the main protagonist feels lonely and opposed to the whole world.

---

[57] Needless to say, Vynnychenko was a consistent supporter of women's emancipation and other issues relating to sex and gender relationships. He admitted that men and women alike could have as many partners as they want, but have children only with those whom they love most of all.

In Vynnychenko's focus on moral issues Lenin saw the ghost of Dostoyevsky. In his letter to Inessa Armand, Lenin wrote the following comment on *Zapovit bat'kiv*:

> My dear friend, I have just read a new novel by Vynnychenko that you sent to me. What nonsense and stupidity! To combine more 'horrors' and to collect 'sins' and 'syphilis' and fictitious crime with blackmail for money for a secret... and a trial of a doctor. All this, together with hysterics, eccentricity, and his claims to his own theory about organizing prostitutes. There is nothing bad about this organization, but the author, Vynnychenko himself, made nonsense out of it, he savours it and has turned it into his hobby-horse. The preface to the novel says that this is an imitation of Dostoyevsky and that the imitation is good. The imitation is, in my opinion, an arch-bad imitation of arch-bad Dostoyevsky. Certainly, all these 'horrors' that Vynnychenko portrayed can happen in real life. But to combine them in such a way means to draw horrors and scare both his imagination and that of his reader, to "forget" about himself and him (1964b, 48: 294-95).

Certainly, Lenin welcomed more such works, among them Gorky's novel *Mat'* [Mother] (1907), which showed, sometimes unnaturally, the transformation of ordinary people (Pavel Vlasov and his mother Nilovna) into dedicated revolutionaries.[58]

In Vynnychenko's attack on bourgeois society, he shows the family as a traditional institution based on hypocrisy and patriarchal relationships. The worst thing was that he denounced revolutionaries who are not consistent with respect to overall changes and who speak first of all about political power while neglecting such issues as family, love, and sex. Strictly speaking, Vynnychenko even considers the family a hidden form of prostitution, where relationships are formed on the basis of material interest and untruthfulness with the self. In his diary he observes:

---

[58] On the relationship between Vynnychenko and Lenin, see Panchenko, Volodymyr. "Zaochna duel'. Volodymyr Vynnychenko i Volodymyr Ulianov-Lenin" [A Duel by Proxy. Volodymyr Vynnychenko and Volodymyr Ulianov-Lenin]. *Vitchyzna* 1-2 (1997): 105-9.

> Ми з Кохою рахували сьогодні шлюби, які знаємо. І з них 60 знаємо нещасливих, 4-5 щасливих і 5-6 під сумнівом. Та хіба ми можемо поручатись за тих 4-5, що вони дійсно щасливі? Через що ж це так? Невже справді закон співжиття чоловіка й жінки є боротьба і ворожнеча? (1: 141, 2 January 1915)

> Today Kokha and I counted the marriages that we know. Among them we counted 60 unhappy marriages, 4-5 happy ones and 5-6 questionable ones. But how can we be sure that those 4-5 marriages are really happy? Why is it so? Is the life of a man and woman together really only struggle and enmity?

The writer applied this question in his story "Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku" (1912). The narrator Vasyl' cannot identify any happy family when he is queried by Iakym. In the latter's opinion, a contemporary "family is a sort of bad habit inherited by humanity" (17). Iakym is that new man who dreams about a home in which people who share his views will live together and where happiness, warmth, and light will prevail. He finds a girl named Lina and they live together without the benefit of a traditional marriage ceremony and against the will of her parents.[59] However, after they officially marry, Lina is haunted by a sexual desire for other men. Iakym wants to help her fulfill her wish and secretly arranges a meeting with the military officer Kalmykov. Her relatives become furious about this 'experiment,' and Lina's brother Serhii, kills Iakym.

---

[59] Such marital non-conformism was typical among modernists, such as Vynnychenko and Joyce. The latter, however, registered his marriage so that his wife Nora would avoid legal complications in dealing with his inheritance.

The court justifies the killing, and in a few months Lina marries Kalmykov. Again, Vynnychenko shows that a man who wants change in society is actually alone, and in danger of being expelled from it.

Vynnychenko's reflections on Ukrainian society were provocative in nature, not only from the purely modernist stance but also from the writer's displacement that generated these provocative ideas. "Exiles are always eccentrics who feel their difference," Said argues (1994, 144). Joyce's stance, e.g., was one of deliberate eccentricity and conflict with his native Ireland. "[W]henever his relations with his native land were in danger of improving,"—Richard Ellmann writes—[Joyce] was to find a new incident to solidify his intransigence and to reaffirm the rightness of his voluntary absence" (qt. in Said 1994, 145). There is also a sense of eccentricity in Vynnychenko's literary profile during this period. For instance, Chykalenko, commenting on Vynnychenko's concept of "honesty with oneself," advised him to be "wise with himself" (1931, 43-44). Apparently, Vynnychenko felt liberated from the social ties and obligations of the homeland, and geographical distance lent him a sense of individual freedom that fostered his provocative attitude toward Ukraine.

Vynnychenko explained his provocative approach to literary material as his desire "to have an exchange of views in an artistic form between other people and myself on the subject of my observations of life and of the consequences which arise from life" (qt. in Struk, 279). The critic Danylo Struk called his writings of this period a "moral laboratory," in which he conducts experiments with human types and situations. In Struk's opinion, this laboratory serves "to test certain ideas that in theory sound so beautiful, to see if they were realizable and what their consequences would be" (287). For instance, Kryvenko in *Memento* allows his infant baby to die to test his adherence to new revolutionary principles. However, in his later works, *Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelia* and *Zakon*, the child characters survive. Another critic, Larysa Moroz, speaks about the game-like nature of Vynnychenko's works, especially dramas: "Every Vynnychenko play is a specific playful experiment, which is an analysis of the possibilities and, in a matter of speaking, versions of man's life in close interconnection with external circumstances" (141).

Besides his literary themes, his relationship with the public was also provocative in nature. Interestingly, one can hardly find any serious conflicts between Vynnychenko and the public or critics prior to his displacement. The first visible conflict occurred after Iefremov's review of Vynnychenko's play *Shchabli zhyttia* in *Rada* entitled "Literaturnyi namul" [Literary Silt] (1908, nos. 45-46; 48-49; 51; 53). Although the play was overloaded with philosophical speculations instead of more dynamic actions, the attack seemed to be too harsh and undeserved. Iefremov, in particular, claimed that Vynnychenko was championing "free love" and "prostitution." His critics (e.g., Iefremov, Chykalenko) persistently urged him to abandon his experiments with new provocative themes and enter the stream of traditional realistic writings, as before. "You have to have a lot of themes from students', workers', and peasants' life, such as in "Zaruchyny" [Engagement] "Holota," and "Borot'ba" [Struggle], etc, without 'sophistication.' You understand me, but you don't want to listen to me but want to say your 'new' word," Chykalenko chided him in one of his letters (qt. in Krutikova, 79). He convinced the writer to give up his philosophy and morality and to be just a belletrist (1931, 23). Vynnychenko responded very emotionally, projecting his opposition onto the entire society: "Who gave you the right to decide that I am sick? I have the same or even bigger right to consider you all to be sick" [Хто ж Вам дав право рішати, що я хворий? Я таке саме, а ще й більше право маю вважати вас усіх хворими], he replied to Chykalenko in connection with his play *Shchabli zhyttia* (14 March 1908). In one of his next letters he drew a sad conclusion about his relationship with the homeland that he felt "foreign" in Ukrainian society (7 July 1908). In spite of public attacks by his critics, he was gratified to receive letters supporting his new vistas, which gave him more confidence in his new direction in literature (26 March 1908).

Vynnychenko's conflict with his critics[60] almost led to a boycott against the writer for his provocative stance to enter "prohibited zones." A new scandal soon erupted in connection with his first novel, *Chesnist' z soboiu*. The *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* published the first part but was later forced to stop publishing owing to readers' protests against these new, sensitive topics and threats to cancel their subscriptions. This conflict forced Vynnychenko to complete the novel in Russian, which was published by "Zemlia" (1911). In any case, the work was confiscated by the Russian authorities for its "amorality" (Panchenko, http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p16.shtml#6.4).[61] This turn of events affected the writer, who was compelled to write his next novel, *Rivnovaha*, in Russian, entitled *Na vesakh zhizni*; it was issued by the same publishing house in 1912. The language switch then led the public to accuse Vynnychenko of treason, as the language issue was at the very core of Ukrainian national self-identification versus Russian imperial identity. The most provocative statement was made by a group of Ukrainian students from the Russian city of Tomsk. They called Vynnychenko "a literary hermaphrodite," that is, a half-Ukrainian and half-Russian writer, and "a slave of All-Russian culture" (Stel'mashenko, 118-119). Other prominent figures (e.g., Chykalenko, Lesia Ukrainka, and Kotsiubyns'kyi) also expressed their concern about Vynnychenko's move to Russian literature. Despite his repeated "threats" to abandon Ukrainian literature for Russian, it was rather his provocative pose to irritate his readership. Responding to his friends' queries about whether he was really going to "betray the Ukrainian cause," he objected to such an assumption and assured them of his loyalty to the homeland. Vynnychenko shed some light on the matter in a letter to the editorial board of *Rada* (97 (12 May 1914): 4). He writes:

---

[60] Among works critical of the play are: "Novyny nashoii literatury" [News of Our Literature. "Dzvin." Collection 1] by Hekhter and "Dzvin. Zbirnyk" [Dzvin. Collection] by Petliura.

[61] His other works that were banned by the censors were the plays *Bazar* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid.'* Since they do not have anti-tsarist features, I can assume that they were also prohibited for 'amorality.'

> Деякими людьми... давно вже ширяться чутки, ніби я беру дуже активну й безпосередню участь в "русскій" літературі, ніби більша половина моїх праць за останні часи написана на російській мові і ніби я от-от зовсім перестану бути українським літератором, так що тільки чутки зостануться про мене, що я колись був в українській літературі.
>
> Отже мушу заявити, що ні про мою безпосередню участь в "русскій" літературі, ні навіть про часове гостювання в ній не може бути ніякої мови, бо зо всього, написаного мною за 12 літ моєї літературної діяльности на "русскій" мові я написав тільки одну річ, а саме *На весах жизни*.
>
> Цю ж річ я написав "по-русскому" через те, що під той час не мав місця в українській пресі для друкування своїх робіт. Це було якраз після того, коли редакція *Л-Н Вісника* одмовилась друкувати у себе повість мою *Чесність з собою* (написану по-українському і запропоновану мною сьому журналові). Редакція *Л-Н Вісника* була присилувана до цього протестом певної частини українського громадянства, яка одмовлялась від передплачування журналу через "неморальність" моїх праць... Під цей час я написав на російській мові *На весах жизни* (4).

> Some people… have been spreading rumours for a long time as though I am participating actively and directly in "Russian" literature, as if most of my recent works

> were written in Russian, and as if I am about to cease being a Ukrainian writer, with the end result that only rumours will remain that I was once in Ukrainian literature.
>
> So, I must declare that there is absolutely no question of my direct participation in "Russian" literature or even my temporary visit, because out of everything that I have written in the "Russian" language during the twelve years of my literary career there was only one thing, *Na vesakh zhizni*.
>
> I wrote it in Russian because at the time I did not have a chance to publish it in the Ukrainian press. This happened right after the editors of *L-N Visnyk* refused to publish my novel, *Chesnist' z soboiu* (written in Ukrainian and submitted to the journal). The editors of *L-N Visnyk* were forced to do so because of the protest of a certain part of the Ukrainian community, which was refusing to subscribe to the journal because of the 'immorality' of my works... At this time I wrote *Na vesakh zhizni* in Russian.

Vynnychenko confirms that he remained a Ukrainian author and all his other works were to be published as translations from the Ukrainian:

> Все, що тепер з'являється на російській мові з моїх писань, є переклад з української.
>
> Редакціям всіх тих "русских" органів, де я друкую свої праці, вже давно офіціяльно заявлено мною, що я ні на яких умовах не даватиму їм своїх робіт, писаних російською мовою (4).

> All my works that are now appearing in Russian are translated from the Ukrainian.
>
> Long ago I informed the editors of all those "Russian" organs where I am publishing my works that under no circumstances will I give them my works written in Russian.

The writer's conflict with the critics, on the one hand, spurred him to persisting in proving his ideas, but on the other hand, it contributed to his alienation and detachment from Ukrainian society. He admitted to his feuds with the critics in a letter to Chykalenko, dated 23 July 1912, from Paris:

> А через що хочу відійти від української преси тепер? Скажу одверто: я зтомився. Кожну річ, яку я задумую для української публіки, я мушу перш усього перевірити, чи не викличе вона поголовного обурення. І вже через це одне та річ стає нудною для мене, я кидаю її. Потім мені надокучили нотації критиків. Який би поганенький критик не був, він вважає за свій обов'язок, за добрий тон, вилаяти мене (не розібрати думку, образ, картину, а тільки вилаяти) (Chykalenko 1931, 317).

> Why do I want to abandon the Ukrainian press now? Frankly speaking, I'm tired. First of all, I must think if every work that I plan for a Ukrainian readership will not cause total indignation. And because of that, work becomes boring for me and I abandon it. Moreover, I am tired of didactic notes from critics. Every mediocre critic makes it his duty, or considers it good form, to scold me (there is no attempt to analyze an idea, image, or portrayal—only to scold).

The writer's ostracism haunted him so much that he found it very difficult to work. Later, after his return, Vynnychenko even assumed that one day this might force him to leave his homeland:

> І знайдуться такі, що плюнуть мені в лице на вулиці і робитимуть мені скандали в публічних місцях, і слатимуть лайливі листи, і зроблять все моє життя на тій Україні, про яку я мрію 15 років, з якої вигнав мене уряд, таким, що я волітиму чужину, заслання, тюрму, що-небудь тільки не свій рідний край. І то за те, що даю свої праці в перекладі на російську мову, що виставляю в перекладах п'єси на російській сцені... [М]абуть, доведеться знову йти у вигнання (*Shchodennyk* 1: 249, 23 January 1917).

> There will be some people who will spit in my face on the street and cause scandals in public places and send offensive letters and make my entire life in Ukraine, about which I have been dreaming for fifteen years and from which the government expelled me, so [bad] that I will prefer foreign lands, exile, prison, anything but my native land. And this is because I am submitting my works in Russian translation and staging translations of plays on the Russian stage … [P]erhaps, I will have to go once again into exile.

At the same time, the Russian literary discourse appeared to be more tolerable and attractive:

> Переді мною розгортається широке російське море. Серед лайок, якими мене обсипали "ортодоксальні моралісти", я читаю часом у російській пресі таку прихильну критику, якої ніколи не чув від своїх. Мало того—там не тільки хвалять чи лають—починають розбірати, що найбільш мені потрібно. Я бачу свої хиби й дефекти, я вірю критикам (деяким) і це мене навчає (Chykalenko 1931, 314-5).
>
> A broad Russian sea is being opened up before me. Among the scolding, with which 'Orthodox moralists' hailed me, sometimes I read such positive critiques in the Russian press, which I have never heard from our people. Moreover, they not only praise or scold but also analyze, which I need most of all. I see my faults, I trust (some) critics, and this teaches me.

But this alienation, bound to certain limits, may be considered an important factor of writers' functioning as a "psychiatrist" and "diagnostician." Alienation, as William Monroe claims, implies discontent, desire to be elsewhere, and accusation. In the critic's opinion, it has a protective and provocative strategy and creates the power both to hurt and to heal (5). While Vynnychenko was in displacement, his conflict with the public showed his desire to escape that simultaneously inspired him to reject the social and moral situation and to become actively involved in the current intellectual discourse in the homeland to change this situation.

2.4. Encounters with the Hostland

Having established Vynnychenko's dominant preoccupation with his homeland, I now move to his relationship with the hostland. As a displaced modernist writer and a traveler (Section 2.2), Vynnychenko, however, was reluctant to adjust more fully to the new milieu and more often than not expressed his dissatisfaction with his current state of displacement, which was accompanied by a longing for the homeland.[62] Here is how he responds to this situation in a letter to Chykalenko:

> Тоскно мені, Євгене Харлампійовичу, без руху, без акції, без реального будування того, коло чого ви всі маєте спромогу ходити. Я зовсім не бачу людей. З французами я не можу та й не хочу сходитись, а росіяне—люди хворі, в анормальних умовах, не піддають бадьорости (23 July 1912).
>
> Ievhen Kharlampiiovych, it is boring for me without movement, without action, without a realistic construction of those things that you are all able to be around. I don't see people at all. I can't and don't want to socialize with French people, and Russians are sick people, in abnormal conditions, they don't cheer me up.

His impressions of places that he visited, such as Capri and Paris, were rather cursory. As it appears from his letter to Chykalenko, Capri did not impress him very much, finding it hardly better than Ukraine (26 March 1908). His first impressions of Paris are also quite reserved: "…[I]t is not such a Babylon, it is not so grandiose and magnificent as could be imagined" [...[Н]е такий Вавилон, не такий грандіозний і величний, як можна собі уявити] (22 September 1908). In contrast, Kotsiubyns'kyi, who lived in Ukraine, was enchanted by Capri and called it a "wonder," an "earthly paradise," and "an island of wonders." It is worth noting that one of Kotsiubyns'kyi's letters to his wife is entirely devoted to the description of the flora on the island (Panchenko 2003, 196). Being an actual tourist (Kotsiubyns'kyi was confident about his return) he, a clerk in a state office, could afford to focus in detail on the various attractions and enjoy them fully, whereas Vynnychenko, a professional revolutionary, who was not permitted to live in Ukraine, had to negotiate his expatriate and exilic feelings, and the latter prevailed.

---

[62] This is in contrast, for instance, with such modernist writers as Joyce, who did not seek to return home and liked speaking Italian at home with his children.

There are different definitions of exile, but they mainly boil down to negative characteristics, both in terms of social hardships in a new land and spiritual isolation. For David Williams exile is "a kind of amputation" (qt. in Dahlie, 3). In Dahlie's opinion, "...[G]enuine exile is a permanent condition characterized by dislocation, alienation, dispossession" (4). "By its nature exile posits the awareness of loss," Tucker argues (xiii). Moreover, the realization that your home is somewhere else and you cannot go there is genuinely painful, and metaphorically is equivalent to death. "For active and sensitive temperaments, exile is sometimes more cruel torment than death," Madame de Stael observed (qt. in Knapp, 7). That is why an exile does not tolerate the present, which may seem absurd and empty. S/he often seeks the present in the past or the future (Pfanner, 144). If there are no connections between the present and the past, at an extreme point it can lead to existential crisis and attempts at suicide. Narratives of exile writings are full of dark colours, gloomy landscapes, and nasty weather. Their characters experience uprootedness, hunger, difficulties of encounter with the hostland, dividedness, and escape.

Vynnychenko's hardships in exile included difficult living conditions, isolation from the homeland, and uncertainty about the future, which leads him to a nervous breakdown, boredom, and escapist tendencies. Lack of money is a constant problem for the writer, as he can rely only on his publications. In one of his letters to Gorky, Vynnychenko asks for an advance payment for his works. But the answer is not comforting: "...[B]ecause there is no money. There is no money anywhere" (Gorky 2000, 265). That was one of the reasons behind his conflict with Gorky, who invited Vynnychenko to publish his works but later refused when he criticized revolutionaries. Vynnychenko accused Gorky of breaking his promise, adding that he had wasted his time and could have offered his works to other publishers. Lack of money will be a leitmotif in his works (e.g., "Taina," "Chudnyi epizod," and *Rivnovaha*).

Even more compelling is his state of isolation from the native cultural milieu: "I don't read anything in Ukrainian, I don't talk, and sometimes I don't even think. Generally speaking, I am not reading or thinking anything and I am growing more insensate by the day" [Я нічого не читаю по-українському, не балакаю, навіть не думаю іноді. Взагалі я нічого не читаю і не думаю і тупію з кожним днем] (7 July 1908). (I touched upon this issue above in my discussion of Vynnychenko's lack of impressions and inclination toward the ideological domain—cf. 117-18.)

Another reason for Vynnychenko's concern was his uncertainty about the future and the dim possibility of his return to the homeland. Although he was more optimistic at the beginning of his displacement (this is reflected, e.g., in "Taina"), later the writer was less confident that he could go home ever: "Shall I finish my life abroad? It's even terrible to think this, but it may likely be so" [Невже доведеться скінчити життя за кордоном? Аж страшно думать, а, мабуть, так і буде], he writes to Chykalenko (11 December 1913). Vynnychenko sought amnesty from the tsarist government but, as his lawyers informed him, the best he could count on was a life sentence (10 March 1914). His exilic feeling intensified over time.

Naturally, these predicaments of exile can lead to physical and nervous exhaustion. In his letter to Chykalenko Vynnychenko writes:

> Більшість часу я просто жалка хвора істота, яку доводить до сліз гудіння мухи, або скрип дерева од вітру. Маленька зміна погоди робить моє тіло важким, голову порожньою, тяжкою. А як погода тут міняється тричі на тиждень, то я тільки те й роблю, що жду постійної погоди. Я певний, що незабаром у мене з'являться галюцинації. Іноді безсонними ночами мені треба просто вставать з ліжка і робить чим-небудь шум, щоб не допустить до уявлення за столом якоїсь фігури. Я стараюсь себе гіпнотизувати, як робить це Зоря Драгоманів, і переконувати, що все це—мої вигадки. І на якийсь час це вдається мені. Але досить якоїсь дурниці, і все пропало. Погано, Євгене Харлампійовичу, я це виражно вже бачу. Правда, я ще не піддавсь зовсім і буду боротись з останніх сил... (7 July 1908).

> Most of the time, I'm a pitiful, sick human being, who becomes tearfully irritated by a fly's buzzing or a tree creaking in the wind. A small change of weather makes my body heavy and my head empty and hard. And since the weather here changes three times a week, the only thing that I do is wait for stable weather. I'm sure that soon I will be suffering from hallucinations. Sometimes during sleepless nights I simply have to get up and make some noise to prevent myself from imagining some figures sitting at the table. I try to hypnotize myself, like Zoria Drahomaniv[63] does, and reassure myself that I have made all of this up. And for some time I am successful. But any silly thing ruins everything. It's bad, Ievhen Harlampiiovych, I see it clearly now. However, I haven't completely succumbed and I will struggle with my last efforts...[64]

Periodically, Vynnychenko experienced boredom stemming from an unnatural lack of activity. In a letter from the Swiss mountains (the village of Bière) he confesses that only at home can he be truly fulfilled:

> Хочу їхати я, Євгене Харлампійовичу, на Україну. Нудно мені тут без життя і людей. Хочу рухатись, чути сльози, самому плакать, а не можу дивитись

---

[63] Zoria Drahomaniv is likely an alternate form of Svitozor Drahomaniv, a Ukrainian revolutionary. Vynnychenko also mentions his name in his diary entry for 1917, dealing with the matters related to the Tsentral'na Rada [Central Rada] (1: 260).

[64] Vynnychenko's difficulties with women may also have contributed to his neurosis. His correspondence with Lusia Holdmerstein (before his meeting and marriage with Rosalia) reveals the tragedy surrounding the birth and death of their child in 1909. Panchenko argues that the writer used this episode in his play *Memento* (http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p4.shtml#2.3).

> на чужі гарні гори, читать книжки і годі. Надокучило страшенно тільки дивитись, як люди живуть, працюють, мають якісь інтереси, а я навіть не можу з ними побалакать, бо і мова чужа і самі вони з їх інтересами чужі мені... Не виношу я покою, противно мені бути спокійним, нудно і досадно. Хоч гірше, аби инче (27 August 1908).
>
> Ievhen Kharlampiiovych, I want to go to Ukraine. I'm bored here without life and people. I want to be active, to hear tears, and to cry myself. But I can't simply to watch beautiful foreign mountains, and read books, and that's all. I'm terribly tired of only watching how people live, work, and have their interests, and I can't even talk to them because the language is foreign and they and their interests are foreign to me… I can't stand the quiet, I don't like it, it's boring and annoying. Let it be worse, as long as it's different.

Consequently, as a response to his exile, Vynnychenko considers the possibility of his further emigration, which I treat as his escapist tendency. Beginning in 1913, the writer repeatedly expresses a wish to abandon his homeland and travel to a remote country. Gurr argues that "the exile leaves on an impulse to escape, not to enjoy travel" (25). Escapism is conditioned by feelings of extreme uprootedness and alienation, which Vynnychenko experienced in displacement. He confesses in a letter to Chykalenko: "Were it not for my wife, I would long ago have gone somewhere to Australia or somewhere else so as not to have either Ukrainian newspapers or magazines" [Коли б не жінка, уже б давно десь подався в Австралію або кудись так, щоб не мати ніяких українських газет, ні журналів] (23 March 1913). He planned among other things to travel to India or a French colony, where his wife could find a medical position[65] and take care of him. He was also considering North America, where he could join the Ukrainian diaspora: “I even have a dream of settling in Canada and becoming a farmer, dig a bit in the earth—it lures my peasant soul” [Я навіть мрію—переїхати в Канаду і зробитись фермером, подлубатись у землі, тягне вона до себе мою мужицьку душу] (28 March 1913). But, as though predicting his future conflict with the diaspora, Vynnychenko was greatly concerned about the prospect of having contact with his compatriots: “I have an idea to go to Canada—after all, our people are there. But I’m afraid that ‘our people’ will turn out to be worse than the foreigners” [Є думка в Канаду їхать, все ж таки ніби свої там. Та боюсь, що “свої” вийдуть гірше чужих] (6 May 1913). Imagining himself emigrating to the US, he writes to Chykalenko: “I will write stories to you from America *a la* Mark Twain” [З Америки буду Вам писати оповідання в стилі Марка Твайна] (1 October 1913).

---

[65] Panchenko (1998) is wrong when he states that Rosalia quit her studies in Paris in 1914. According to documents I found in Vynnychenko's archive at the Institute of Manuscripts she obtained a certificate stating that she had graduated from the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Paris (Fund 293, no. 239). However, as a foreigner with a French certificate, she was not allowed to practice medicine in France or anywhere else in Europe.

On the other hand, Vynnychenko experiences nostalgia, which softens and reconciles the bitterness of exile. This feeling, for instance, may have been behind his illegal and risky visits to Ukraine during the period 1907-14. In 1908 Chykalenko convinced him not to long for the homeland, since it was, after all, unreasonable on his part to go back because of tsarist persecutions of the opposition after the failure of the revolution of 1905-07: “Do not long for Ukraine […] you should overcome your exile and wait for better days, because such days have arrived that I have never seen before. There is an unprecedented policy of revenge and terror” (qt. in Panchenko, http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p1.shtml#). Chykalenko was therefore astonished by his unexpected encounter with the writer at the railway station in Fastiv: “Vynnychenko came to the village to find impressions and to touch ground” (1931, 137; dated 5 June 1910). As is known from Vynnychenko’s correspondence, he planned to leave for the homeland permanently. In his letter to Liusia Holdmerstein he writes: "In going to Ukraine, I am signing my own death sentence. After my first arrest I will commit suicide" [Їдучи на Україну, я сам підписую свій смертний присуд. З першим же арештом я кінчаю своє життя] (qt. in Panchenko. http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p4.shtml#2.3). At the same time he feels alienated from the Ukrainian society and has a plan to immigrate to Canada. This unbearable condition of Vynnychenko's displacement (which was concretely addressed in *Rivnovaha*), reveals clear threats to continuities of his identity. The thought of suicide is very indicative in this respect (Davis, 2).

For a certain period of time Vynnychenko's stay abroad intensified his intellectual ability and stimulated the work of memory. But how long would this state of affairs last? His homeland gradually becomes more remote, sensitivity whithers, and vivid impressions fade. The writer himself predicted his creative exhaustion unless he regained his native social and cultural environment: "…[I] dreamed about amnesty… I dreamed of finally living at home if only for a little while. I'm bored of being a foreigner my whole life—either at home or here. And the most important thing is that I have to be at home, among people definitely. Otherwise, I won't be able to work soon" [...[М]ріяв про амністію... Мріялось пожити нарешті хоч трохи дома. Так надокучило все життя бути чужинцем—чи у себе, чи тут. І, головне, треба мені бути дома, серед людей треба обов'язково. Інакше хутко і працювать не зможу] (17 March 1913). Gurr suggests that exile "concentrates on the scrupulous depiction of his home in his art" (25). This, of course, is true. But in focusing on Ukrainian themes at the beginning of his displacement, in time Vynnychenko found himself in a situation marked by a lack of vivid impressions from Ukraine. On the one hand, this stimulated the writer to elaborate on "works of ideas," but on the other, this prompted him to look closer at the local life, which now provided him with new experiences and immediate impressions. In a letter to Chykalenko (12 March 1909) Vynnychenko complains about the lack of materials. In response Chykalenko suggests elaborating new themes about the hostland:

> Once you mentioned in a letter, the last one I believe, that now you don't have any observations because you are cut off from life. But what about émigré life? Doesn't it provide you with any materials? It seems to me that you can observe many interesting things there. It can offer themes and materials for any kind of literature—plays, stories, etc (qt. in Panchenko, http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p14.shtml#6.2).

Chykalenko's advice came at the right time. In his diary entry for 1911 (the year in which Vynnychenko began his diary), he already sets himself the task of depicting French life (1: 41).[66]

It is important to emphasize the dynamic nature and gamut of experiences and feelings in displacement—both positive and negative, which are not strictly demarcated and may overlap. Although the bitterness of exile prevails (*Rivnovaha*), reflecting Vynnychenko's own predicament, in this section I will also focus on the positive experience of expatriates ("Taina") and nostalgia as a way of overcoming the bitterness ("Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" and some other works from this period, which are relevant to the discussion). Some of these questions already surfaced in the analysis of Vynnychenko as a displaced modernist writer (*Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and "Olaf Stefenzon"). However, those works present a different type of a hero—a Bohemian artist, who enjoys his stay abroad. In contrast, in "Taina" and *Rivnovaha* we have a revolutionary type, who is forcefully uprooted from his homeland, does not fully accept the "bourgeois life" in Europe, and seeks to return home and continue his revolutionary cause. It is important to note that Vynnychenko's exilic feelings grow with time, and accordingly the works under consideration also reflect this shift. In choosing the method of my analysis, I find it helpful to focus on character analysis, as it reveals more subjectively the writer's approach to hostland themes (based on his recent experience or lyrical recollections), in contrast to more artificial literary creations designed for the embodiment of his ideas.

---

[66] This note refers to 1911 in general, and Vynnychenko did not specify the concrete date.

2.4.1. Expatriation without Pain: "Taina" and Other Stories

The story "Taina" [A Mystery] (1910), Vynnychenko's first work about the hostland (it is set in Paris), is a good example of the gradation of displacement. It portrays Perederiienko, a former revolutionary from Ukraine, as a lonely and contemplative person who has a generally positive attitude to his expatriation, conveyed through a number of characteristics: his optimistic worldview (especially evident when contrasted to the pessimistic French professor Laroche), openness to people, love of singing, association with bright colours, etc. Though rendered in lyrical tones, the challenges of the hostland and a longing for the homeland also surface in the story, foreshadowing the further bitterness of exile (e.g., *Rivnovaha*). Here I shall focus on the analysis of the main protagonist Perederiienko whose displaced condition quite closely, although not completely, approximates the writer's. For the purposes of contrast and comparison, I shall also consider the image of the French professor Laroche and will discuss two other stories, "Taiemna pryhoda" [A Mysterious Adventure] and "Chudnyi epizod", written in the same year, 1910.

9

In order to proceed with the analysis, it is necessary to recapitulate the main events of the story. It deals with the philosophical issue of optimism vs. pessimism and happiness vs. malice. The two positions are represented respectively by Perederiienko and Laroche. Both reside in the same building. Their meetings often turn into philosophical debates, in which each expresses and supports his own worldview. At the end of the story, Laroche witnesses the happy reunion of a blind tramp and his dog under a bridge, which touches him deeply. With this the narrator suggests that he ought to get rid of his malice and be transformed into a more positive person. Eventually, he goes to live with his granddaughter. This transformation of a man from a pessimist into an optimist and the realization of human happiness that is inside every human being reveals the "mystery," the main message of the story. What is important from our perspective is that the optimistic worldview is represented by a displaced person, whereas a representative of the hostland displays pessimistic characteristics.

The first accidental meeting between Perederiienko and Laroche clearly reveals two opposite characters and positions. Perederiienko's former image of the Frenchmen makes him expect a positive response:

> Я засміявся, бо я таки справді ждав, що він, як і всі вони, сі французи, засипле мене фразами подяки.
>
> —Ви часто смієтесь,—сказав він таким тоном, немов ставив мені се на увагу.
>
> Я не переставав посміхатись (152).

> I smiled because I really expected that he, like all of these Frenchmen, would shower me with words of thanks.
>
> —You smile often,—he said to me in a way as if to draw my attention.
>
> I didn't stop smiling.

Laroche, who despite his academic position and presence in his own homeland, is lonely and pessimistic, and takes pleasure in people's misfortunes. Here are Perederiienko's impressions of him: "Він ніколи не сміється, коли сміються всі люде" [He never smiles when everyone is smiling]; or "I noticed that he looked at everything that was merry, bright, and joyful with indifferent scorn…" [Я помітив, що на все веселе, ясне, радісне він дивиться з недбалою зневагою...] (162).

Laroche's experiences have made him disillusioned and stripped him of positive emotions. Perederiienko, he believes, is also destined to become this way. Laroche's dilemma suggests Vynnychenko's own attitude toward his recent revolutionary past:

> —Гай-гай!.. Я колись теж був таким, як ви... Я теж любив сміятись і співати. О!.. І я теж любив думать, що ми маємо велику ціль, ми—люде, царі природи. Я також хотів рятувать людей і вести їх в царство любови, святих ідеалів, високих мрій. Так, так, мій друже, се стара руїна, що сидить перед вами, мала ті самі помилки, що й ви. Ви колись їх так само пізнаєте, як зараз я. Се—закон. Се закон... (166).

> —Well, well!.. I too was once like you… I also liked to laugh and sing. Oh!.. And I also liked to think that we had a great goal, we—the people, the kings of nature. I also wanted to save people and lead them to the kingdom of love, sacred ideals, and high dreams. Yes, yes, my friend, this old wreck sitting in front of you had the same flaws as you. One day you'll understand them as I do now. This is the law. This is the law…

In this story Vynnychenko develops the idea of people's inner harmony that parallels his concept of "honesty with oneself." Laroche implies that a lack of inner freedom is the main reason behind people's unhappiness and that makes him pessimistic about the world:

> —[Ляро답] А ви свободу любите?
> —Через неї я тут і живу, а не дома.

> —Я не про політичну свободу. У нас в республіці такі ж раби, як і у вас. Он!—він сердито протягнув руку до вікна—повний город рабів. Я про другу свободу питаю (165).

> —[Laroche] And do you like freedom?
> —That's why I'm here, not at home.
> —I'm not talking about political freedom. We have the same slaves in our republic as in your country. Look over there!—he pointed angrily at the window—the city is full of slaves. I'm asking you about another kind of freedom.

In contrast, Perederiienko is portrayed as an optimist, who believes in people's happiness. The fact that he is in a foreign country, unlike Laroche, makes the contrast more significant. Vynnychenko scarcely intimates a past for Perederiienko, but from short phrases like those above we can assume that he was involved in revolutionary activity and had to abandon it. Despite his uncertain social status and lack of money, he never emphasizes his problems and rather enjoys his stay abroad. He likes his loneliness, which he transforms into a powerful source of reflective energy. Perederiienko's attitude toward the new country and its people is very open and sincere. References to bright colours, the sun, smiling, and singing percolate throughout the story: "I was not lonely at all, people were humming pleasantly below, above in the sky the bashful eyes of stars were twinkling from behind clouds, and an angry, gloomy, and funny old man was sitting on a small suitcase! ... I told him everything that was in my heart, which was like a fiddle on which merry melodies are played" [І зовсім я не був самотнім, внизу приємно гуділи люди, вгорі з-за хмар кліпали засоромлені очі зірок, а на чемоданчику сидів лютий, хмурий і кумедний дідусь! ... Я говорив йому все, що в мене було на душі. А на душі було як у скрипці, коли на ній грають веселі мотивчики] (160).

Perederiienko's positive emotions are conveyed through his constant singing:

> —Ви раз-у-раз співаєте,—вмить, не рухаючись промовив Ярош. Його, мабуть, се дуже зацікавило.
>
> Я скромно зітхнув, але нічого не сказав.
>
> —Людина тоді співає, коли їй радісно,—знов буркнув дідусь трошки сердито вже і замовк, немов чекаючи одповіді.
>
> Я скоса поглядав на його. Смуглявий гарний ніс його уперто був похнюплений до свічки.
>
> —Мені таки радісно,—нарешті сказав я.
>
> Тоді він озирнув мене строго, пильно й з такою недовірчивою цікавістю, неначе я був якоюсь знахідкою доісторичної епохи, в якій він сумнівався.
>
> —Завжди?—муркнув він.
>
> —Розуміється (157).

> —You are always singing,—said Laroche at once without moving. It seemed to interest him very much.
>
> I sighed modestly but said nothing.
>
> —A man sings when he is joyful,—the old man growled a little angrily and fell silent, as if waiting for an answer.
>
> I looked at him indirectly. His tanned, nice nose stubbornly drooped toward the candle.
>
> —I truly am joyful,—I said eventually.
>
> Then he looked at me severely, intently, and with such distrustful interest, as if I were some sort of dubious discovery from a pre-historic era.
>
> —Always?—He muttered.
>
> —Certainly.

Perederiienko's explicitly positive mood, which is sustained through the entire story, is motivated by a kind of irrational existential happiness at being alive and observing the life of other human beings. Kaczurowsky called "Taina" a very "humane work," reminiscent of the best works of O. Henry (2002, 158). Here is how Perederiienko feels at the end of the story:

> На покрівлі мансарди сміялось сонце вечера, внизу синім легким туманом повилися вулиці веселої столиці світа, віяв п'яний вохкий вітер з півдня.
>
> Я закинув руки за голову, потягнувся, набрав повні груди вітру з півдня і радісно, щасливо засміявся (179).

> The evening sun was smiling on the roof of the mansard, down below, the streets of the merry capital of the world were enveloped by a light blue fog, a drunk and humid wind was blowing from the south.
>
> I put my hands behind my head, stretched myself, breathed in the wind from the south, and smiled joyfully and happily.

Significantly, even Perederiienko's negative experience, i.e., the shortage of funds, is transformed into an ironic attitude and philosophical contemplation. Here his thoughts about hunger are imbued with subtle irony:

> Сьогодні я зайшов в бібліотеку погрітись. З заклопотаним, серйозним виглядом попрохав собі январську книжку "Світового Огляду" і став читать.
>
> Там я вичитав з статті одного професора, як треба піддержувати своє здоров'я. Страшно мені вподобався той спосіб. Легкий, зручний, надзвичайно простий і без всякого сумніву певний. Треба не їсти три-чотири дні. Він мені зразу надав бадьорости. Останній раз я їв учора ввечері. Сьогодні якраз сутки. Я ще маю попереду троє суток, можу не їсти і те мені піде на здоров'я. Чудесно! (154)

> Today I came in the library to warm myself up. With a concerned and serious expression I requested the January issue of *World Review* and began reading it.
>
> There I read an article by a professor about how to keep oneself in good health. I liked that method very much. It's easy, convenient, extremely simple and undoubtedly reliable. You must not eat for three or four days. It encouraged me straight away. The last time I had a meal was yesterday evening. Today is 24 hours. I still have three days of fasting and that will improve my health. Wonderful!

Even the fact that Perederiienko has to sell his sofa does not seem to trouble him: "Since I sold my sofa and sleep on the floor, I am convinced that it's much better.

Nothing squeaks under you, and you can turn in all directions and not worry that you'll fall down during the night" [З того часу, як я продав свою канапку й сплю долі, я переконуюсь, що так далеко краще. Ніщо не скрипить під тобою, можна повертатись на всі боки й не клопотатись про те, що вночі впадеш додолу] (155).

There is another problem related to Perederiienko's encounter with the hostland—the recognition of Ukrainian identity in the West—which also surfaced in "Olaf Stefenzon" and will be addressed below in *Rivnovaha*. Here is the scene of the meeting between Perederiienko and Laroche:

> —Моє прізвище Лярош.
> —Чудесно. А моє Передерієнко.
> —Як??
> Він широко розплющив очі. Я засміявся. Се вічна історія з моїм прізвищем, воно наводить жах на французів.
> —Передерієнко—повторив я.
> —Ні, я сього не вимовлю—рішуче й суворо покрутив він головою.—Та мені й не цікаве ваше прізвище. Adieu!
> —Adieu! (153)
>
> —My name is Laroche.
> —Wonderful. Mine is Perederiienko.
> —What??
> He opened his eyes widely. I smiled. This is an ongoing problem with my surname, which strikes the French with terror.[67]
> —Perederiienko—I repeated.
> —No, I can't pronounce it—he shook his head decisively and sternly.—Anyway, your surname isn't interesting to me. Adieu!
> —Adieu!

---

[67] This dilemma also appears later, when Vynnychenko moves to the south of France and wonders what to call his new place of residence, so that it would be easier for the French to pronounce it: "I have to give it a name, so that the French don't distort it and make fun of it" (*Shchodennyk*, 23: 232). He eventually names it "Zakoutok" [Cozy Corner].

The biggest challenge for Mr. Laroche is the name of his Ukrainian acquaintance. It is much simpler to call him a "foreigner" (162). Assigning a proper name, often with symbolic meaning, is an intrinsic feature of Vynnychenko's writings (e.g., Kornii/Polar Bear and Ryta/Black Panther in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*). It would appear that Vynnychenko deliberately chose the surname Perederiienko, which requires an effort even of native speakers. Serving as a parallel to Vynnychenko's own surname, the surname of the main protagonist, in fact, symbolizes the problem of recognition of Ukrainian identity in the West: the Frenchman Laroche, like the German Emma Valdberg in "Olaf Stefenzon," is indifferent to Ukrainian identity. Perederiienko, however, is not really affected by this ignorance and he responds with a smile.

The depiction of the local space is quite cursory, nonetheless it endows the work with exotic foreign flavour. These are indigenous realities, such as money (sou, 153), names of streets (rue de Seine, rue Dauphine, 170), and the use of French words (adieu, 153). For many place names Vynnychenko maintains the original French spelling.

Although Perederiienko is virtually an exile, who was forced to leave his country because of his political activity, emotionally he remains more an expatriate. In his negotiation between a remembered homeland and the physical hostland he enjoys both. A sense of expatriation as a "soft" form of displacement (Tucker, xvi) rests on close ties with the homeland and the possibility of a return. Alfred Polgar rendered this thought in a very poetic form: "Oh foreign land, how beautiful you are—for the person who still has a home" (qt. in Pfanner, 20). Perederiienko's joyful feeling can be explained by the fact that he has his own homeland, and he is optimistic about his return:

> Я потягнувся. Хм! Чого мені радісно? Хіба я знаю? Радісно, що вітер такий м'який і соковитий. Радісно, що зорі кліпають, як засоромлені оченята

> дитини. Радісно, що внизу гомонять істоти похожі на мене і чогось рухаються і спішать кудись, і минають повз мене. Хіба я знаю? Радісно, що далеко-далеко єсть країна, де їдять вареники з крапинками сиру і гай увечері зверху позолочений, а внизу таємно-темний, вогким пахом будить щось в душі. Хіба я знаю? (157)

> I stretched myself. Hm! Why am I so glad? Do I really know? I'm glad because the wind is so gentle and rich. I'm glad because the stars twinkle like a bashful child's eyes. I'm glad because down below human beings like me are making noise and for some reason are moving about and hurrying somewhere, and passing me by. Do I really know? I'm glad because there is a country far away where people eat *varenyky* with cheese and in the evening the grove is gilded on its top and mysteriously dark at the bottom, awakening something in one's soul with a humid smell. Do I really know?

The finale of the story reveals the victory of optimism and happiness over pessimism and malice. It is remarkable that the Ukrainian expatriate has a crucial influence on a representative of the hostland, who begins to be transformed into a kinder man and is reunited with his granddaughter. To show his gratitude to the "foreigner" for his support, Laroche invites Perederiienko to visit him in his new home:

> І очі його вперше здались мені ніжними, ласкавими і сумно-жартівливими, як промінь сонця перед вечером.
>
> Я засміявся й з охотою пообіцяв йому се.
>
> —Ви завжди смієтесь—сказав він сердито. Потім раптом обняв, поцілував мене й, прошепотівши:—"Смійтесь, серце, завжди",—поспішно вийшов з хати (179).

> And for the first time his eyes seemed soft, tender and sadly playful, like a sun beam before nightfall.
>
> I laughed and eagerly promised to come.
>
> —You always laugh—he said angrily. Then suddenly he embraced and kissed me, whispering "Smile, my dear fellow, always," and hurriedly left the apartment.

Reflecting the gradation of displacement, exilic feelings are also characteristic to Perederiienko, foreshadowing the bitterness of exile in the later work, *Rivnovaha*. They, however, do not concern his negation of the hostland but his imagined brief journeys to the homeland, which are portrayed through tender nostalgia and warm lyricism. Small details on different perception levels imply very intimate relationships with his home:

> І раптом на вулиці чогось мені згадалось, як їв я раз гречані вареники біля Золотоноші. Вечір був. Сонце зайшло за млинами, що розставили крила, немов в екстазі підняли їх і застигли. Край неба був задумливо-рожевий. З ставка віяло духом вохкости, ряски, духом таю, повитого вечором. А тут на присьбі стояли в великій червоній мисці з жовтими пасочками темно-сірі, великі вареники з крапинками сиру. З одного боку, повернeного до заходу, вони червоніли. Червоніла й густа сметана в полумиску. Як я їх їв, боже! Ех! Хай тобі всячина! (154-155)
>
> I don't know why, but suddenly I remembered how once I ate varenyky[68] with buckwheat near Zolotonosha. It was evening. The sun had gone down beyond the mills that had spread their wings as if in ecstasy and froze. The edge of the sky was a dreamy pink. A scent of humidity, duckweed; I hold my breath, enveloped by the evening, was wafting from a pond. And there on a bank of earth near the house stood a big red bowl with yellow stripes, which held large, dark grey varenyky with droplets of cheese. On one side, turned to the west, they were red, as was the thick sour cream in the plate. Oh, God, how I ate them! Oh! Nothing beats that!

Sensory perception, including smell, taste, audial and visual images, plays a significant role in the work of memory in displacement. Margaret Morse considers them through the imaginary link of a person and home:

> Feelings and memories linked to home are highly charged, if not with meaning, then with sense memories that began in childhood before the mastery of language. A fortuitous and fleeting smell, a spidery touch, a motion, a bitter taste—almost beyond

---

[68] 'Varenyky' is the Ukrainian word for perogies.

> our conscious ability to bid or concoct or recreate home is thus an evocation that is of this sensory world, ephemeral and potential in the least familiar (63).

In the story "Taina" the main protagonist Perederiienko with great passion alludes to taste (varenyky), smell (humidity) and light (golden, dark)—these very intimate feelings that deconstruct the exilic sensibility of the author.

If one looks at the characters throughout Vynnychenko's stories, their background and nature become more evident; they are like facets of one character. This pattern of a lonely man with a vague background living in an unknown city recurs in stories such as "Taiemna pryhoda" and "Chudnyi epizod." The main protagonist in "Taiemna pryhoda," Dovhal', is hiding from the police in a large city. His way of life and tranquility remind us of Perederiienko:

> Цілий день він сидів у кімнаті, схилившись над книжками й потираючи своїм звичаєм лоба, а ввечері недбало обтирав рукавом завжди чогось забруднений капелюх, натягав його на голову і, незграбно пересуваючи ноги, виходив на вулицю. Тут він зупинявся перед вікнами магазинів, роздивлявся товари й добродушно посміхався, як людина, якої сі товари не торкаються, але все-таки цікаво подивитись, чим займаються всі сі істоти, що шаркають оттут круг його, що сидять за тими вікнами, серйозно хвилюються з-за штучок, виставлених на вікнах, і навіть все життя проводять з ними.
>
> Потім заклавши руки за спину йшов далі і теж добродушно посміхався всьому, що бачив. На поліцаїв дивився з дитячою настороженістю, заклопотано застібав піджака і поспішав поминути їх. Поминувши, закладав знов руки за спину й дивився на світ з прихильністю та інтересом.
>
> Так гуляв він кожний вечір і кожним вечером був задоволений (121-122).

> He sat in a room all day, bending over books and scratching his forehead out of habit. And in the evening with his sleeve he would carelessly wipe his hat, which was always dirty for some reason, put it on his head, and shuffling his feet awkwardly, go out onto the street. There he stopped in front of store windows, looked at the merchandise and smiled good-naturedly, like a man who didn't care about this

> merchandise, but found it interesting to look at what preoccupied all the beings milling around him. Those beings standing in front of those windows, seriously worrying about what was displayed in them and even spending their whole lives with them.
>
> Then, putting his hands behind his back, he walked further and also smiled good-naturedly at everything he saw. He looked at policemen with child-like attention, fastened his jacket anxiously and hastened to pass them. Having passed them, he again put his hands behind his back and looked at the world positively and with interest.
>
> That was the way he walked every evening and he enjoyed every evening.

From the vocabulary in the above passage, we can draw a conclusion about Dovhal's intense intellectual activity ("he sat in a room all day, bending over books"), optimism ("he…smiled good-naturedly," "he enjoyed every evening," "he…looked at the world positively"), and curiosity about his new surroundings ("he…found it interesting to look at what preoccupied all the beings milling around him," "he looked at the world… with interest"). It is likely that the protagonist does not belong to this place and observes it as if from the sidelines. Interestingly enough, he is not afraid of policemen, who would not do any harm to him: his attention to them is child-like.

A similar anonymous protagonist appears in "Chudnyi epizod," who also has time on his hands to wander the streets ("In wonderful weather, I like to walk along the streets" [Я люблю в чудову погоду гуляти по вулицях] (142)) and enjoy his extraordinary condition. His tranquility and positive attitude are his salient characteristics:

> Пізно було вже. На вулиці туман, як наміткою обгортав ліхтарі. Прохожі з піднятими комірами і руками в кишенях поспішно минали повз мене. Вони знали, куди йшли. А я не знав, тому й не поспішав. Я навіть рук не ховав у кишені і коміра не піднімав. Я тільки посміхався (140-141).

> It was already late. The fog, like a bandage, covered the lanterns on the street. Passers-by with raised collars and hands in their pockets were in a hurry to pass me by.

> They knew where they were going. But I didn't know, so I wasn't hurrying. I didn't even put my hands in my pockets or raise my collar. I only smiled.

Like Perederiienko, the protagonist in "Chudnyi epizod" also lacks money and food: "There were times when we ate only potatoes and only had a coat to cover ourselves" [У нас були такі обставини, що ми годувались одною картоплею і вкривались тільки плащем] (140). He also has no money to pay for a prostitute.

Unlike in "Taina," Vynnychenko does not elaborate the setting of these two stories. The text implies that the events in "Taiemna pryhoda" and "Chudnyi epizod" take place in the homeland (e.g., the Ukrainian woman's name Natalia; the characters do not have problems communicating in public places) or most probably in L'viv or other cities in Western Ukraine. But the theme of all three stories, the types of characters and narrative structures are quite similar. Only in "Chudnyi epizod" we have an artist whose reflections are directed toward aesthetics. After arguing with his beautiful girlfriend. Natalia, the unnamed hero accidentally meets a prostitute. Her ugliness is her most salient feature, which attracts him as an artist. He is genuinely moved when he learns that she is making an ugly sculpture—which is strangely beautiful. Thus, the hero finds himself in a dilemma between beauty and ugliness—external and internal—which, however, do not have strict limits and may transform into each other. In this respect, the story echoes two other works, *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and "Olaf Stefenzon," and reveals Vynnychenko's growing interest in the theme of beauty.

In most of the works of this period, the Ukrainian setting is quite evident through the portrayal of active revolutionaries (e.g., "Student" [The Student] (1907), "Moment," and "Zina" [Zina] (1909)), in which the characters belong to their places. In contrast, in "Taina," "Taiemna pryhoda," and "Chudnyi epizod" Vynnychenko reveals his displaced condition, which is conveyed through the image of optimistic lonely men, who spend their time walking on the streets of a big city and contemplating life. It seems that the protagonist does not belong entirely to the place and is staying there temporarily. Vynnychenko's hero is deliberately passive and contemplative, a change from the active revolutionary types in his stories with Ukrainian themes.

2.4.2. Bitterness of Exile: *Rivnovaha*

Whereas the story "Taina" has dense philosophical underpinnings, Vynnychenko's second novel *Rivnovaha* is entirely devoted to exile. What are the conditions of exile? What happens to exiles over a certain period of time? What are the reasons for changes and what should be done to overcome the hardships of exile? These are some of the questions that came out of Vynnychenko's personal experience and were addressed in *Rivnovaha*.

The novel was written in 1911. According to Vynnychenko's diary (1: 41) and correspondence with Chykalenko (15 May and 3 June 1911), he worked on the manuscript in May-June in Paris. The writer informed Chykalenko in May that he was polishing the work, so we can assume that he probably started it earlier. This was Vynnychenko's first work that he wrote entirely in Russian after *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* refused to publish his previous highly provocative novel, *Chesnist' z soboiu*. *Rivnovaha* was published in Russian as a separate edition of the anthology *Zemlia* (Moscow, no. 9) in 1912. The Ukrainian version was issued in 1913 by the publishing house "Dzvin" (Kyiv). Both versions were reprinted several times: the Ukrainian one in

1919 ("Dzvin"); 1927 and 1929 ("Rukh," Kharkiv); and the Russian in 1913 and 1917 ("Moskovskoie knigoizdatel'stvo," Moscow).

Based on Vynnychenko's exile experience, *Rivnovaha* is remarkable in a number of ways. Firstly, as some critics claim (A. Nikovs'kyi, O. Hrushevs'kyi), it advanced a new theme in Ukrainian literature (if one discounts "Taina"). Although other writers (Shevchenko, Franko, Stefanyk, and Lepkyi) had also touched upon this theme, none of them addressed exile so broadly. For instance, writers from Western Ukraine (Franko, Stefanyk, Lepkyi), who witnessed the mass migration of their compatriots to the North American continent during the 1890s, were predominantly preoccupied with the tragedy of departure, often embodied in symbols of death. They did not have any opportunity to reproduce a picture from inside the new territory.[69] Secondly, the novel signals a shift in the character types: from the stoic revolutionary in *Chesnist' z soboiu* to the depiction of an alienated individual. Thirdly, although the novel received contradictory reviews, it was generally considered an aesthetic success, more so than *Chesnist' z soboiu*, which was burdened by a cumbersome ideological structure (Ievshan 1998c, 573). The main concern of critics was whether Vynnychenko's criticism of revolutionaries would affect the revolutionary movement in the Russian Empire (the work depicted the all-Russian Imperial revolutionary movement and was addressed to readers in that country). In popular literature, revolutionaries were often idealized as heroes. Consequently, there was a certain fear (e.g., Lenin, Gorky) that any criticism would seriously undermine political and ideological efforts to oppose the monarchy. Gorky perhaps articulated the fiercest reaction. In his letter to V. Miroliubov he wrote:

---

[69] For example, the crying of cranes flying away like emigrants is associated with death in the well known poem "Zhuravli" [Cranes] by Bohdan Lepkyi, which became a popular song. A similar melancholy story is depicted in "Kaminnyi khrest" [A Stone Cross] by Vasyl' Stefanyk, in which the main hero builds a cross in his yard prior to his departure across the ocean.

> Vynnychenko's work almost shows talent if one were to take into account the persistence with which he has compiled all the dirt and ugliness of life in order to throw into the face of former 'saints and heroes'... In the end, there is not a single normal person in this silly work (1955, 177-78).

Gorky as a forerunner of the ideologized literature of the time is well known: he supported works that introduce the theme of "social usefulness" and particularly in 1913 called for protests against the premiere of the play *Nikolai Stavrogin* based on Dostoevsky's novel *Besy* (1953, 156). Ilia Ignatov in *Russkiie vedomosti* noted that *Rivnovaha* had only "dreadful figures" and it lacked positive characters, although his general impression was quite positive (qt. in Stel'mashenko, 114).[70] The majority of critics concede that the negative flavour of the novel was rather conditioned by the challenge of exile, and that the writer generally succeeds in reflecting that reality. One of the first reviews appeared in *Rada*:

> Vynnychenko's second novel is based on the life of Russian[71] émigrés in Paris. Influenced by vivid impressions from current life in emigration, the novel portrays genuine types of emigrants, full of real life. Someone may notice a certain one-sidedness or incomplete depiction of life, but no one can blame him for being artificial and tendentious in this depiction ("Novi," 5).

"*Rivnovaha* is not a slander, it emerges from the natural psychological response of those people who were forced to live in the artificial and severe conditions of émigré life without real employment," writes Doroshkevych (226). As we can see, Vynnychenko's focus on exilic life allowed him to utilize his immediate impressions and experience that were lacking in his depiction of Ukrainian life, owing to his absence from his country.

---

[70] Stel'mashenko was referring to Ignatov's review in *Russkiie vedomosti* (1912, no. 112).
[71] The author refers here to the subjects of the Russian Empire.

It is worth noting that the work has been neglected in studies of Vynnychenko's writings (Panchenko, Kharkhun). For instance, in Panchenko's study of Vynnychenko's works *Rivnovaha* appears to be the only major novel omitted from analysis. The likely reason is that the exile theme contrasts sharply with works on homeland themes and settings (e.g., *Chesnist' z soboiu, Zapovit bat'kiv, Po-svii* and *Bozhky*). Examining the novel from the perspective of displacement, I shall focus mainly on characters that represent a response to exile, as well as address the issues of an encounter with the hostland, and the role of nature in the portrayal of the exile condition.

Rivnovaha is a broad portrayal of the life of exiles in Paris during 1907-11. The novel lacks a structured plot and consists of a number of episodes revealing different aspects of exile existence: social conditions, intellectual and artistic activity, and moral and philosophical concerns. There are more than a dozen characters in the novel, each representing specific exile problems (e.g., existential ennui, loneliness, hunger, debauchery, inebriation, violence, suicide, nostalgia, encounter with the hostland, and adjustment, etc). The characters may be divided into positive one, i.e., those who make the effort to overcome the hardships of exile (e.g., Khoma, Tania, Mary, Fenia and Ladia), and negative ones, i.e., those who are corrupted by exile (e.g., Shurka, Adolph and Stameskin). As indicated in Vynnychenko's diary and correspondence, the novel is actually his reflections on his current status and on the fate of revolutionaries who took part in the 1905-1907 revolution in the Russian Empire and had to go into exile to escape tsarist repressions. Parisian exile is depicted as a social condition that is exposed to the so-called "law of equilibrium"—the main idea of the novel. The author implies that true revolutionaries, in order to sustain their identity, must return home and continue their revolutionary activity; otherwise they will be corrupted and marginalized.

The first problem of exiles is their encounter with the hostland—what Vynnychenko himself experienced and described in his letters to Chykalenko and other stories. Although in *Rivnovaha* the writer gives us a number of French words and realities to underscore the local atmosphere (e.g., bonjour, monsieur, centime, bon, c'est ca, diners, femme de menage, mademoiselle, première, opera, la presse, entrez, cela dépend, c'est ca mon vieux, très bien, adieu, n'est-ce-pas, Moulin Rouge, Saint Germain, and Café de Panthéon, etc) we hardly see the hostland; the novel is entirely inhabited by exiles. The impression is created that the two worlds, local and exilic, exist separately. As Sriblians'kyi notes in his review: "There is nothing French [here], except for streets, cars, and a few simple words from everyday French vocabulary" (1912, 304). There is not, in fact, a single French person in the novel. There are simply "French people" as a collective. Critics (Hnidan and Demianivs'ka, 159; Sriblians'kyi 1912, 304) noted the absence of "social rootedness" of the characters in *Rivnovaha*, who seem to come from nowhere and are going nowhere. This underscores that integration into the daily life of a hostland is a challenge, especially at the beginning of exile. It is interesting to follow the thoughts of Khoma, who observes the clash of two different cultural spaces:

> Хома зупинився на своїм шумливім розі і довго стояв під ліхтарнею, дивлячись тьмяними, байдужими очима на рухливі пацьорки людей. Маячили часом росіяни. Їх легко пізнати: нема в них того спокою й впевнености, з якими проходить хазяїн країни—француз. Обличчя їх ніби щось шукають. До них не чіпляються проститутки; крамарі квіток не простягають їм букетів (47).

> Khoma stopped at the noisy corner and stood for a long time under the lamp watching the moving streams of people with his clouded, indifferent eyes. Sometimes Russians loomed. They are easy to recognize: they don't have that calmness and confidence that their hosts, the French, have. Their faces seem to be looking for something. Prostitutes don't pay attention to them; flower salesmen don't offer them bouquets.

The allusion to unaffordable prostitutes echoes similar leitmotif in his stories and aptly conveys the low status of émigrés in the hostland society. The image of the street in the above episode is also recurrent in Vynnychenko's works on displacement, implying instability and homelessness. But whereas in previous works the image of the street indicated mysteriousness, Bohemia, the joy of wandering or curiosity (cf. "Olaf Stefenzon," "Taina," "Taiemna pryhoda," and "Chudnyi epizod"), in *Rivnovaha* we note the exiles' indifference to the street and, conversely, the street's indifference to them.

The exiles must constantly overcome the ignorance of foreigners concerning Ukraine and the Ukrainian identity.[72] In *Rivnovaha* Mary tells Tania a story about how she tried to flirt with a Frenchman, whom she met accidentally on the street:

> "Ви читаєте по-англійськи?"—"По-англійськи, по-французьки, по-німецьки, по-італійськи, по-російськи, по-українськи"... Останнього,—обурюйтесь Таня!—він не знає. "По якому?"—По-українськи, говорю. Нарід такий є, красивий, поетичний, як італійці. Тридцять міліонів їх є.—Здивований. "Де ж вони?!" "На місяці!"—регочуся... (76).

> "Do you read English? [asked the French man].—"[I read] English, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Ukrainian..." The latter [language]—be indignant Tania!—he doesn't know. "What?"—Ukrainian, I say to him. There is a nation like

---

[72] The colonial issue also surfaced regarding Ukrainian-Russian relations in the novel (e.g., the use of pejorative nicknames for Ukrainians, such as "khokhol" (219-20) and "maloros" (240)). But Vynnychenko did not emphasize this, as both Ukrainian and Russian exiles were mainly presented together as one group from the Russian Empire and equally exposed to exile conditions.

> that, beautiful and poetical, like Italians. There are thirty million of them.—He's surprised. "Where are they?!" "On the moon!"—I laugh uproariously...

Again, the way Ukrainian exiles react to their unrecognizability in the novel is different from that in "Taina." Whereas in "Taina" Perederiienko simply smiles, seeming to reproach himself for the awkwardness of his surname, in *Rivnovaha* the exiles feel indignation about Europeans' ignorance concerning the "thirty million strong" nation, which is accompanied by uproarious laughter.

A remarkable feature of the novel is that Vynnychenko not only depicts the life of exiles, but also approaches exile as a philosophical issue. The encounter with the new social and cultural milieu and the sudden rupture of ties with the homeland for many characters create an existential crisis that must be filled with activities and involve personal transformation. This change can lead to different results: stagnation, attempts to adjust to a new society or to return home. The protagonist Mary introduces what she calls "the law of equilibrium" that fills every vacuum:

> ...Від рівноваги не втечете. Як хто-небудь тут заплакав, то хтось там уже засміявся. Один здихає, за те інший родиться. Не можна—рівновага... Цікава, властиво машинка, се життя. І ви подивіться, Танюк,—і зрадійте: не тільки з людиною так, а і з світами. Все поривається до неї, до рівноваги... Ось ми, наприклад, емігранти: видерли у нас шматок так званої душі, позбавили громадського життя, утворили порожнечу по однім боці, ми і схиляємся в інший. А як природа не любить спокою і надмірного відхилення, то і заповняє нам порожнечу,—кому картами, кафе, вином, кому коханням, кому Богом, кому сатаною... Хто що переносить краще. Агітатори, оратори, трибуни, депутати—поробилися розносщиками, авіяторами, комівояжерами, художниками, фокусниками, шклярами. Про партії згадують з іронічною усмішкою... Не можна інакше—порожнеча вимагає заповнення. Інакше—догори ногами полетиш (80).

> ...You cannot escape equilibrium. If anyone cries here, then another laughs there. One croaks, another is born. You cannot escape it—equilibrium... This life is an interesting little machine. Just look, Tania—and be glad: it doesn't just happen to people but to entire worlds. Everything strives to this, to equilibrium... Here we are, émigrés: they ripped a piece of so-called soul from us, deprived us of social life and created nothingness on one side, so we incline toward the other side. And since nature abhors quietness and excessive deviation, it fills up the gap for us: for some with cards, coffee, wine, sex, for others with God and the devil... It depends on who can endure it better. Agitators, orators, tribunes, deputies have become peddlers, pilots, salesmen, painters, magicians, glass-cutters... They recollect their parties with irony... There is no other way—the gap has to be filled up. Otherwise, you would fly with your feet upside down.

This feeling of emptiness and irrelevance leads Vynnychenko's characters to perceive the challenge of exile in broad philosophical terms. According to this law, all transformations in nature and social life take place only to maintain the state of equilibrium. Mary speaks to another protagonist, Tania:

> Все—дурниці! І революції наші, і соціялізми, і моралі, і мужчини, любови, сухоти, смерть. Все це—тільки незначні коливання життя. ... Прогрес, рух наперед. Куди наперед? ... Але тоді нехай мені по щирости скажуть: чи менша стала в нашому столітті сума страждань відносно суми радощів людських? ... Яку ми маємо, кажучи по щирости, підставу сподіватися цього? Ніякої. Який же тоді поступ? Є поступ у того гарячого повітря? Вперед чи назад рухається воно? Нічого подібного. Рухається, от і все. То вгору, то вниз, то у ліво, та у право. А десь є пункт, від якого воно не може піти і до якого вічно поривається. То є до рівноваги... І більше, Танюк, нема нічого (78-79).

> Everything is nonsense! Our revolutions, and socialism, and morals, and men, loves, tuberculosis, death. All this is only the small vibrations of life. ... Progress, forward movement. Forward where? ... Let them tell me sincerely: has the sum of human suffering, compared to happiness, decreased in our century? ... What reasons, frankly speaking, do we have to hope for this? None. Then what is progress? Is there progress in this hot air? Does it move forward or backward? Nothing of the kind. It just

> moves and that's it. Up and down, to the left and to the right. But there is a certain point from which it cannot depart and for which it constantly strives. Toward equilibrium… And there is nothing more, Tania.

The law of equilibrium thus provides a key to understanding Vynnychenko's vision of exile. If nature abhors a vacuum and strives for equilibrium, so do people in social life. In the new space, exiles have to transform themselves and change their activity in order to adapt to the new circumstances. But it is a challenge to do this, as people have already established themselves in one society and have their ideals. To remain revolutionaries they have to return home. Vynnychenko portrays a number of characters who demonstrate different individual responses to these challenges of displacement.

Presenting a broad view of exiles' life, Vynnychenko initially shows them continuing their revolutionary activity. They establish associations, organize meetings, give lectures, hold discussions and cultural programs, and even manage to maintain a fund to help poor exiles. Tania proudly calls exile groups "socialist islands in a sea of bourgeois life" (68). Thus, the exiles' "exclusive" attitude toward the hostland also has a class dimension: as revolutionaries, they could not fully accept the capitalist order, as they saw themselves as new people who aspire to build a socialist society (Vynnychenko will emphasize this during his next displacement in the 1920s). But soon their revolutionary activity appears to be merely an emulation of their former activity in the homeland, for which many exiles have no practical use and which seem quite abstract and irrelevant to the current situation. This feeling of being out of place is the first taste of the bitterness of exile that haunts even the positive characters.

After the collapse of the revolution in 1905-1907, the general atmosphere among certain circles of the intelligentsia in the Russian Empire was characterized by disillusionment and exhaustion. As Hryhorii Kasianov observes, "The revolution of 1905-1907…caused a deep moral crisis in the intellectual milieu, because its defeat was a collapse of the world outlook of several generations of intellectuals" (21). Displacement also contributed to this disillusionment. Exile became an extreme condition that revealed the intellectuals' moral characteristics. Exile was a mirror that helped them look at themselves from a different perspective, so that many see themselves in a rather repellent light. As Raoul Auernheimer notes: "People's characters become transparent during the emigration. This is one of the reasons why it is so difficult to endure" (qt. in Pfanner, 134).

Doroshkevych noted "too many divided, instead of strong, characters" (231) in Vynnychenko's works. One of them is Khoma, the main protagonist, who is to a certain extent Vynnychenko's alter-ego. Khoma participated in the revolutionary upheavals of 1905-07 and was forced into exile. Even though he is one of the few exiles who manage to work (as a turner), he feels quite lonely and alienated from his fellow revolutionaries. Being a very dedicated revolutionary (he was even imprisoned) at home, he now finds himself totally out of his depth. Indifference to what is going on around him is probably his most salient feature, though one can still recognize his former strong will and vital energy. His indifference is conveyed through a number of characteristics (the way he watches people on the Parisian street is described on p. 166). Lack of interest in participating in a discussion is accompanied by Khoma's "curt" speech and closed eyes:

> —Добродію Хома! Се—свинство! Відповідайте, коли вас питають.
>
> —Не хочу відповідати—байдуже і сухо сказав Хома, не розплющуючи очей (29).

> —Mister Khoma! This is swinishness! Answer when somebody asks you a question.
>
> —I don't want to answer—Khoma replied indifferently and curtly, without opening his eyes.

and with emotional coldness and self-estrangement:

> Вираз облич у всіх мимохіть і непомітно став м'якший... Тільки один Хома сидів з тим самим обличчям, втягнутим в себе, холодним (29).

> Everyone's faces became somehow imperceptibly gentler… Khoma was the only one who sat with the same face, cold and closed off.

The purposelessness of Khoma's current state is rendered by the image of his head bent down:

> Хома довго йшов, низько схиливши голову, немов розглядаючи в себе під ногами (46).

> Khoma walked for a long time with his head bent down, as if he were looking at his feet.

His fellow revolutionary Ostap Klunia, who had not seen Khoma for half a year, notes cardinal changes in him and assumes that he has been ill:

> —А, знаєте, ви дійсно, дуже перемінилися… Ось зараз бачу це. Спочатку не помічав... Наче те лице і… інша людина... А усього тільки місяців шість не бачились. Того разу як я був у Парижі, сього не було. Може хорували? (53).

> —You know, you've really changed a lot… I see it now. At first I didn't notice… It's like the same face but… a different person… And we haven't seen each other only for about six months. I didn't see it when I came to Paris the last time. Have you been ill?

Khoma's apathy is further developed through a description of his residence:

> Помешкання Хоми складалося з маленької кімнатки і кухні. Кімната була похмура й холодна. Зовсім голі стіни без єдиного малюнка або гравюри. Біля

> стіни ліжко, накрите пуховиком з сірим накривалом, вузьке, надуте, похоже на труну; невеличкий самодільний стіл; токарський верстат і табуретка. На підлозі стружки блідо-жовтими кучерями подібними на льокони, валялись під станком і табуреткою. Більше нічого. Ні книг, ні приладів до писання (56).
>
> Khoma's residence consisted of a small room and a kitchen. The room was gloomy and cold. The walls were completely bare without a single picture or engraving. There was a bed near the wall, covered with a fur blanket and grey bedspread, narrow, puffed up; it looked like a coffin; a small hand-made table; a lathe, and a stool. On the floor pale yellow wood shavings, like locks of hair, were scattered under the lathe and the stool. There was nothing else. No books, no writing tools.

This description already indicates Khoma's hermit-like way of life. The absence of books and writing tools implies that the hero has abandoned his intellectual activity, in which he was earlier engaged as a socialist. One should note this change in the protagonist, who is contrasted with the revolutionary Dovhal' in "Taiemna pryhoda," who "sat in a room all day, bending over books." The comparison of the bed to a coffin symbolizing the hopelessness of his exile is particularly striking.

Another important characteristic of Khoma as a divided person is his intention to escape. Escapism, as a person's preoccupation with escape and change of a worse condition for a better one, is an important characteristic of exile experience. In his discussion of this feature in connection with American expatriates of the 1920s, Cowley underscores its ephemeral nature (236). Igor Kaczurowskyj examines escapism as a literary phenomenon in greater depth. He considers escape, along with resistance and surrender, to be a response to an extreme human condition. There are four factors that contribute to escapist motif in literature: 1) the nature of a writer's works, which are conditioned by both individual characteristics and experience; 2) national tradition; 3) literary fashion; and 4) limitation of writer's freedom by political factors (1973, 1104). A simple rendering of an escape in a work of art—in a farce, detective or adventure story—does not necessarily mean escapism. Kaczurowskyj writes:

> What is most important is not escape but [the writer's] attitude to it. Escapism appears when an author is preoccupied with the motif of escape, treats it as the only possible solution, constructs a culmination around it or piles up different versions of this motif, recurring constantly to it in his works (ibid., 1099).

Reviewing escapist writings in world literature,[73] the critic notes escapist motifs in Vynnychenko's works (*Rivnovaha, Na toi bik, Soniachna mashyna*). He does not elaborate on them, considering them of minor importance for the writer. For us, however, the escapist motif in *Rivnovaha*, as represented by Khoma, is a very important argument for characterizing the bitterness of exile. Referring to Kaczurowskyj's scheme above, I argue that it is inspired by the individual characteristics and experience of Vynnychenko, who intimated his escapist mood in his letters to Chykalenko (cf. 148). The writer actually does not focus on Khoma's (or other characters') departure into exile in Europe as an escape from political repression in the homeland. He portrays Khoma—and that is essential for our perspective—as a person who virtually seeks escape from escape, namely escape from the unbearable condition of exile. In the novel Khoma plans to donate all his money to the party and leave for Canada (235). The fact that he is going to a foreign country without leaving any money for himself betrays the symbolic rather than pragmatic character of this step. Ridding himself of all his financial means symbolizes a desire to make a break with his past and start from the beginning. Significantly, Khoma seeks escape not to another European country to be close to his homeland, but to another continent (in his letters to Chykalenko he also mentioned some overseas places, such as

---

[73] In particular, he names the novels *Il fu Mattia Pascal* [The Late Mattia Pascal] (1904) by Luigi Pirandello and *Martin Eden* (1909) by Jack London, poetry by Stefan George, etc.

Australia, India, North America, one of the French colonies, where he would like to go—cf. 148).[74] Canada is a perfect symbol of a place for a new beginning, a kind of virgin land, or "terra incognita," that often attracts migrants. Indeed, many political émigrés left for North America to avoid repressions after the revolution of 1905-1907. One of them was, for instance, the revolutionary Pavlo Krat (1882-1952) who first went into exile in Austro-Hungary (he stayed in L'viv) and then moved to Canada in 1907. There is no evidence indicating that Vynnychenko met Krat personally, but both remarkably resemble each other as a type of dedicated revolutionary and intellectual: both belonged to the Revolutionary Ukrainian Party, both repeatedly smuggled revolutionary literature from Galicia to Russian Ukraine, both were the authors of the first utopian works in Ukrainian literature, and both subsequently underwent a significant re-evaluation of their positions (Krat eventually became a Ukrainian Protestant minister, and Vynnychenko elaborated his own philosophical doctrine—Concordism).[75] Consequently, Khoma's intention to migrate to another continent can be considered what Kaczurowskyj calls "escape into the unknown," in contrast to what he calls "escape-return" (1973, 1100). In the former case, the condition must be so unendurable that any change of place would necessarily lead to a better one. The narrative of the novel, however, shows us a very vague line between these two concepts: an escape into the unknown turns into an escape-return after Tania's love revives Khoma and they decide to go home. Manifested during Vynnychenko's first exile in *Rivnovaha*, escape to other places (e.g., *Poklady zolota*, *Nova zapovid'* [The New Commandment], 1949) or time periods (e.g., *Soniachna*

---

[74] It is natural for exiles to find a place in which to settle down that is close to their homeland. Pfanner, for instance, observes that many German writers who settled in the USA after 1933 longed for Europe, and some (e.g., Thomas Mann) eventually moved there after World War II. Nabokov, who lived in the USA during the war, also moved to Europe and settled in Switzerland.

[75] A more detailed biography of Krat can be found in his Crath, Paul. *Autobiography of Rev. Paul Crath*. Unpublished Mss., n.d.

mashyna, *Vichnyi imperatyv*), thereafter becomes part and parcel of the writer's state of mind and one of his responses to displacement.

Among the other characters in *Rivnovaha*, Arkadii also experiences a huge transformation in exile. He combines his revolutionary activity with art (he is a painter). Whereas in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and "Olaf Stefenzon" Vynnychenko depicts expatriate artists who are preoccupied with beauty, in *Rivnovaha* Arkadii cannot concentrate on his painting because he is experiencing the hardships of exile. Painting hardly provides him with the means of survival. "But am I really a painter? I am pretending to be a painter" [Але хіба я художник? Я удаю художника], he declares remorsefully (144). His roommate Adolph laughs at the fact that Arkadii maintains his "spiritual interests" when there is nothing to eat. He shares a sandwich with Adolph, who stole it from their colleague Tania. Although Adolph does not care about his wrongdoing, Arkadii is tormented by his bad behavior. He is really depressed seeing former revolutionaries who have virtually betrayed their ideals. Eventually he becomes extremely lonely and alienated. Divulging his loneliness, he allows Tania to read his letter and diary—a typical form of personal reflections in Vynnychenko's works of this period (cf. *Po-svii* and *Bozhky*). These documents are a striking revelation of transformation in exile, so much so that Arkadii realizes his substantially altered identity:

> Товариш—Таня! Та ні: просто Таня. Не хочу брехати, хоч вам не хочу брехати. Вас, розуміється, здивує сей лист. Ви чекаєте, розуміється, признання в коханні і вже суворо сціпили уста. Але не сердьтесь, сього не буде. Пишу вам просто для того... Ось знов хотів збрехати. Пишу тому, що більше з вами не говорю. Останнього часу навіть мало бачу вас. О, я ні на що не претендую, на Бога не думайте сього, мені тільки хочеться сказати вам, що мені тяжко. З уривка щоденника Ви переконаєтесь в сьому. Мені хочеться сказати се кому-небудь, просто сказати і більше нічого. Але в мене нема нікого, кому б я міг сказати це.

> Я—самітний. Се—дивно, я, бувший соціяліст, людина соціяльних звичок, я—самітний. Так, се вірно, се так. Я знаю, словом "бувший" я настроюю вас проти себе, але, думаю, виграю тим, що буду щирий. Все життя моє я брехав і брехатиму, удаватиму не те, що я є, а вам не хочу (142).

> Comrade Tania! No: simply Tania. I don't want to lie, I don't want to lie at least to you. This letter will, of course, surprise you. Naturally, you are expecting a declaration of love and your mouth are already pinched severely. But don't be angry, this won't happen. I'm simply writing to you to… See, I wanted to lie again. I'm writing to you because I no longer talk to you. I rarely see you lately. Oh, don't think that I have anything in mind; God forbid that you should think this. I just want to tell you that it's hard for me. You'll see from an excerpt of my diary. I want to tell this to somebody, just to tell and that's all. But I don't have anyone to whom I could say this. I'm lonely. It's strange that I, a former socialist and a man of socialist habits, am lonely. Yes, it's true. I know that by using the word "former" I will pit you against me. But I think that I'll win through my sincerity. All my life I have lied and will continue to lie; I'll pretend to be not who I am not, but not to you.

The realization of this bitter change comes also from Arkadii's transformation from a revolutionary in the homeland to a person who in exile is forced to do odd jobs for a living. He writes in his diary:

> Субота. І сьогодня мив шиби. Цілий день бігав від одного магазину до другого і цілий день занятий був тим, чи встигну скінчити свій урок, щоб мене не прогнали і щоб могти і завтра і позавтра, а багато-багато ще днів мити вікна крамниць. Вчора мене опанував сміх. Я лежав в темноті на свому матраці і беззвучно, нестримано реготав. Три роки я просидів у в'язниці, пережив два роки заслання, витратив десятилітній запас нервової енергії—і все для того, щоб спати на матраці і бігати з ганчіркою вулицями Парижа. Якщо це не смішне, то не знаю, що може бути смішне (142-43).

> Saturday. And today I cleaned windows. All day I was rushing from one store to another and all day I was preoccupied with whether I would finish my assignment on time, so that I would not be fired and so that tomorrow and the day after and for many, many days I can wash store windows. Yesterday I was overcome with laughter. I lay in

> the dark on my mattress and laughed soundlessly and irrepressibly. I have spent three years in prison and two years in exile, I have expended a ten-year reserve of nervous energy—just to sleep on a mattress and rush with a rag on the streets of Paris. If that's not funny, then I don't know what is.

Even Paris, the cultural capital of the world, which is a magnet for many artists and intellectuals, does not shield him from loneliness. "I can't believe that I live in the capital of Europe. I doubt that I am even living on the planet inhabited by any other living beings" [Мені не віриться, що я живу в столиці Европи. Я сумніваюсь, чи живу я на планеті, населеній ще якимись живими істотами], writes Arkadii in his diary (144), his words providing a marked contrast to Perederiienko's attitude toward the city in "Taina." Loneliness forces him to value his relationship with the rude Adolph: "Adolph makes fun of me either to my face or behind my back; Adolph is dirty and coarse. Adolph is corrupt, but I value him highly because I don't have anybody else" [Адольф і в очі і поза очі глузує з мене, Адольф брудний і грубий, Адольф випотрошений, але я ціную його дорого, бо в мене більше нема нікого] (144). This echoes the motif of existential loneliness, which forces individuals to value relationship, no matter how unnatural, like the archetypical one between Robinson Crusoe and Friday. The extreme condition of exile, as revealed in the characterization of Arkadii, helps him begin to see things clearly and realize that he has taken a wrong path in life, and now he reproaches himself and feels estranged from the exile community.

The poet Ostap Klunia is another example of transformation in exile. At the age of 26 he has an incurable disease as a result of the hardships of his revolutionary activity. On the verge of dying, he begins to reevaluate his life and attitude toward the revolution. He says to Khoma:

> ...[Я] тільки тут ось, на ліжку, починаю трошечки розуміти життя. Їй Богу, Хома...—І знаєте, я вповні згоджуся з Олександром... Є тут один товариш... Ми часто розмовляємо... Яка, наприклад, проста думка: ось ми соціялісти, страждаємо за людство (як ні як, а таки страждаємо!), любимо все людство, а звичайної простої любови між собою ще не знаємо. Се ж просто вражає, властиво кажучи (55).

> …[O]nly here in bed I am beginning to understand life a little. I swear to God, Khoma…—And you know, I totally agree with Oleksandr… He's a friend of mine… We often talk… Here's a simple thought, for instance: we, socialists, suffer for the sake of all humankind (say what you will, we do suffer!) and we love all of humankind, but we don't experience ordinary love among themselves. That's amazing, actually.

Ostap feels useless and desperate because he is not dying in battle but somewhere in a foreign country: "I'm only 26… And how vexing it is to die without any results. What did I endure hunger for? What was I beaten for? And I will see nothing of this" [Мені всього двадцять шість років... І як ні як, а досадно: так, без наслідків вмирати. За що ж я голодав? Били теж за що небудь? А я сього нічого і не побачу] (55). At his burial his colleagues sing a revolutionary song:

> Замучен тяжелой неволей,
> Ты славною смертью почил... (173)

> Tortured by difficult captivity,
> You passed away in glory…
> [Translation from Russian]

It sounds rather ironic, as "difficult captivity" was applied to those who were in Russian prisons. The allusion to the prison, thus, is symbolic and parallels the state of exile.

Interestingly, the female characters (Tania, Fenia, Mary) seem to withstand the conditions of exile better. Tania, for instance, manages to find a job at a factory and plans to obtain her education in Paris. She is a person who does not lose her personal qualities in difficult circumstances. Her moral strength is particularly emphasized through her relationship with her boyfriend Shurka. "Shurka is bowed and gloomy. There is something hopeless and bitter in his whole posture" [Шурка зігнутий, понурий. Щось безнадійне, гірке у цілій постаті] (179). Shurka is divided between his pure love for Tania and easy flirtation with Annette, and between his revolutionary ideals and current involvement with a group of former revolutionaries, who now call themselves Satanists. Tania does her best to support Shurka and inspire him to take up positive activity. However, Shurka cannot tolerate his divided soul and commits suicide. Despite her positive worldview, Tania sees clearly the unbearable situation of exile. Here is how she feels during Ostap's burial:

> Таня почувала, що вона може зараз сісти на землю, обхопити голову руками і ридать. Над Остапом? Над собою? Над сими втомленими серйозними обличчями покинутих, загнаних кудись людей? ... Як дивно й болюче образливо: далекі, туманні громади чужого міста, чужі могили, чуже небо... (174).
>
> Tania felt as though any minute she would sit on the ground, grab her head with her hands and wail. For Ostap? For herself? For these tired, serious faces of abandoned people hunted down somewhere? ... How strange and painfully insulting: remote and foggy communities of a strange city, strange graves and a strange sky…

The way Tania perceives the hostland and herself in the hostland is essentially different from Perederiienko's in "Taina." Whereas the optimistic Perederiienko is full of vital energy and curiosity, the main feature of the exiles in *Rivnovaha* is their exhaustion and uselessness. Where Perederiienko sees himself dissolved among the people of the hostland country and belonging to one human race ("human beings like me"), Tania notes the strangeness of her new surroundings. Interestingly, this includes not only material things ("strange city," "strange graves"), but also "a strange sky"—often a symbol of human unity, as articulated by Plutarch, who states his attitude toward exile in "De exilio":

> [The sky above] is the boundary of our native land, and here no one is either exile or foreigner or alien; here are the same fire, water and air; the same magistrates and procurators and councillors—Sun, Moon and Morning Star; the same laws for all, decreed by one commandment and one sovereignty—the summer solstice, the winter solstice, the equinox, the Pleiades, Arcturus, the seasons of sowing, the seasons of planting (qt. in Guillén, 277).

Longing for her homeland, in her imagination Tania transports herself to the Dnipro River, a symbol of Ukraine in the folk and literary tradition:

> Таня втомлено схилила голову на руку. От так перенестись би на Україну, на Дніпро, а Дніпро теплий, голублячий. Сонце палає і пісок як черінь гаряче напаленої печі. Лягти в видовбаний човник на м'яку пряну, запашну постіль з лугового сіна, заплющити очі й віддати всю волю ніжному колисанню старого Дніпра... (230).

> Exhausted, Tania propped her head on her hand. This is how she would like to transport herself to Ukraine, to the Dnipro River, and the Dnipro is warm and caressing. The sun burns, and the sand is like a hearthstone in a heated oven. To lie on a gentle and fragrant bed made of meadow hay, to close her eyes, and to give herself up wholly to the gentle swaying of the ancient Dnipro...

She realizes that to sustain her identity as a revolutionary, she must return home. To her, exile is associated with grime and a slow death: "No, truly Mary, I can't go on like this, I can't look at them. Why do they stay here in this Paris, in this dirt? Why don't they at least go home to croak? Oh, God! I don't understand this. Well, imprisonment, penal servitude... Is it better here?" [Ні, справді, Мері, я не можу так, я не можу дивитися на них. Ну, чого вони сидять тут, в сім Парижі, в сім болоті? Чому хоч здихати додому не їдуть? Господи! Не розумію сього. Ну, в'язниця, каторга... Але хіба тут краще?] (128)

Fenia too is portrayed as a devoted revolutionary, who cannot endure watching the transformations of her colleagues. For her, moral and spiritual death is worse than physical death. That is why she decides to return home, even at the risk of being arrested:

> Краще там у в'язниці згнити, аніж тут дивитися на ріжні мерзоти. ... Я їду не тому, що мені треба, а тому, що хочу... Бо я не можу задихатися в цій атмосфері безробіття, спльоток, романів та болота! Мені важко бачити, як люди, яких я поважала, падають на моїх очах (231-232).

> It is better to perish in prison over there than to watch all these loathsome people here. ... I'm leaving not because I need to but because I want to... Because I will be stifled in this atmosphere of unemployment, gossip, love affairs, and quagmire. It's difficult to watch how people whom I respected go down in my eyes.

As a result of Mary's revolutionary activity, she falls ill with an incurable disease, just like the poet Ostap. She knows that she has only one year to live, and this knowledge probably causes her to behave in a very open and unusual fashion. She suddenly feels as if she has gotten rid of the shackles of her revolutionary obligations and can now be herself. It is she who presents her philosophical view of the mechanisms of exile life, which is subject to the law of equilibrium (cf. 171-72). Realizing this, she decides to return, even if this means that she is going home to die. Mary refuses to go to Italy for treatment because she is afraid to die there rather than at home. She says passionately: "I want to die at home, in the snow…" [Хочу вмерти дома, в снігу...] (264).[76] The motif of death and the desire to be buried in the homeland permeate exile writings. This reveals the importance of spiritual connection and awareness of the place of belonging for uprooted exiles. As Lynda Jentsch-Grooms points out, "perhaps the exile's greatest fear is that of dying while removed from his native land" (36). Mary's return may be viewed symbolically as the gravitation of exiles to their homeland and a response to their displaced condition.

---

[76] Sensory memory of snow is mentioned by the critic Domnica Radulescu who tells about a Russian woman traveling to Russia "to feel, smell and hear the snow" (186).

To show that the motif of return and gravitation to the homeland is recurrent in Vynnychenko's works, I would like to make a short digression to his novel *Khochu* [I Want] written in 1915, right after the writer's return home.[77] This novel features interesting parallels with *Rivnovaha*. Here the writer depicts a Russian poet from Saint Petersburg, Andrii Khalepa, who on the verge of an existential crisis, attempts suicide, which symbolizes the absurdity of his present existence. After recovering, he suddenly finds the lost roots of his Ukrainian background and visits Ukraine, planning to introduce a new method of labour organization based on the collective principle and common interests of all workers. This cardinal change of activity is also symbolic and implies a new beginning, as Khoma in *Rivnovaha* plans to donate all his money and start a new life in Canada. In broad terms, *Khochu* reflects the emancipation of Ukrainian national consciousness on the eve of the 1917 revolution, which was followed by the establishment of a short-lived independent state. One of the ideas in the novel is also the hero's search for identity after turbulent years spent in a place where he realizes he did not belong. Although Vynnychenko shows Khalepa's return from the Russian city of Saint Petersburg, this can be also seen as a projection of his return from European displacement, a kind of return of a prodigal son, who has finally found the sense of his existence in his homeland. It is interesting to note that Khalepa breaks with his Bohemian way of life in St. Petersburg, which may also be viewed as parallel with this kind of life in Europe. Here is how Khalepa contemplates his past life in St. Petersburg during his sojourn in Ukraine: "Do I really need to return to St. Petersburg, to Lida, Kostiashkin, Ogloblin, the restaurants, gossips, flirtations, literary and artistic groups with their mutual hostility, jealousy, pettiness, self-praise, emptiness, and boredom?" [Та й знов у Петербург, до Ліди, Костяшкіна, Оглобліна, ресторанів, пльоток, фліртів, літературно-артистичних гуртків з їхньою взаємною ворожнечою, заздрістю, дріб'язковістю, самовихваленням, порожнечою, нудьгою?] (155). This rhetoric is strongly reminiscent of the exiles' complaints in *Rivnovaha* about the stifling atmosphere in displacement (cf. Tania's and Fenia's words above) and their desire to return.

---

[77] As it comes from Vynnychenko's diary, he worked on the novel in Moscow. It was published in 1916.

Among the other female characters in *Rivnovaha*, only Annette is depicted in clearly negative terms. From a revolutionary she turns into a coquettish woman without moral restraints, one whose sense of life is based on flirting with men. She perverts Tania's boyfriend, Shurka, and actually contributes to his suicide. Khoma could have become her next victim. She tells him: "If you agree to spend the night with me, I will leave this herd of roaring beasts with pleasure" [Якщо ти згодишся провести у мене вечір, я з приємністю покину сю отару ревучих тварюк] (227-28). The "herd of roaring beasts" is how she now describes her fellow revolutionaries. But Khoma, as we saw above, is so indifferent to everything that he simply does not have the inspiration to engage in this kind of relationship, although they had an affair earlier. On the other hand, his refusal symbolizes his desire to be out of the dirty atmosphere of the exile community, while his love for Tania strengthens his hope for rejuvenation.

But even positive characters are prone to various petty squabbles. The two main revolutionary groups, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Social-Democrats are occasionally intolerant of one another. Invited by Tania to attend a lecture organized by the Social-Democrats, Fenia responds straightforwardly: "I don't have any desire to listen to social-democratic nonsense" [Не маю охоти слухати ріжну соціялдемократичну нісенітницю] (216). A kind of irony underlies the discussion whether to address a person with the traditional ('dobrodii' [Sir]) or in the revolutionary way ('tovarysh' [comrade]) (221). A discussion about art and revolution leads to a rigorous demarcation of the two domains: can a revolutionary deal with art when the revolution is not yet completed? Tania suggests: "For a true socialist, revolution and struggle comes before everything else... And if art [for him] is above everything, this means that he is not a socialist" [Для справжнього соціяліста насамперед революція, боротьба, а потім все інше... А як мистецтво вище за все, то значить, він не соціяліст] (31). All these disagreements hardly seem essential to the current state of exile and arouse nothing but irony.

Besides the positive characters who manage to overcome their exile by returning home, Vynnychenko depicts another group, characters that are totally in the grips of moral degradation. The most explicit manifestation of the latter is the transformation of former revolutionaries into anarchists and Satanists. The anarchists (e.g., Stameskin, Apolinarii) organize a group called "Huliai dusha" [Romping soul], whose "purpose is pleasure in life" (238). They indulge in drinking, scandals, and debauchery. Their behaviour is clearly revealed during an "émigré evening." They do not pay for their tickets or the food and are very brutal with people, claiming: "Long live the 'Romping soul!' Down with the bourgeoisie! Down with the intelligentsia!" [Нехай живе "Гуляй душа!" Геть з буржуазією! Геть інтелігенцію!] (249). Their debauchery finally results in the rape of their colleague, the young revolutionary Ladia, a positive character, who aspires to obtain an education at the Sorbonne. Stameskin, who participates in a violent act of rape, flees to London to avoid responsibility. It is interesting to point out that Gorky, who was in exile at that time, emphasized this problem in his letter to Vynnychenko: "It seems that soon this miserable Russian intelligentsia will perish from suicides and debauchery, in which they indulge with more and more fervour" (2000, 216).[78]

Exile transforms Adolph the revolutionary into a highly egotistical and cynical anarchist without moral restrictions and a person who corrupts the revolutionary milieu. He embodies the problem of hunger in exile. In his diary Vynnychenko records a note to himself "to emphasize hunger" in the novel *Rivnovaha* (1: 41). While Perederiienko views his inadequate nutrition philosophically and ironically ("Taina"), this problem leads to more serious consequences in *Rivnovaha*. Adolph looks with a grudging eye at how "indifferent French people eat their 'dinners'" (10).[79] Meeting a couple that speaks Russian, the "generous Slavic language," he is inspired to beg for food but receives only aloof looks from "bourgeois exploiters." Interestingly, Adolph's revolutionary consciousness is ironically undermined by the way he identifies the passers-by as "bourgeois exploiters": he spots a new hat on the man's head, and his cane with a silver handle (11). He eventually steals Tania's sandwiches and urges Arkadii to share them with him. Ultimately, in order to earn a living, he decides to become a gigolo to a rich, old lady. This is the point where his revolutionary ideals encounter the realities of exile and crash.

---

[78] This situation may be paralleled with Siberian exile: "After the storms of 1905-06 the situation of the exile changed for the worse. Cases of suicide among the exiles, some as a protest against intolerable treatment, shocked the entire country" (Olgin, 355).

[79] Here Vynnychenko uses the French word for special emphasis.

Besides the typical manifestations of bitter exile, such as hunger, lack of money, menial and low-paying jobs, moral degradation, and alienation, Vynnychenko uses another device—the negative depiction of local nature and surroundings, usually conveyed through such elements as dark colours, noise, bad weather, etc. Accordingly, the novel begins with a gloomy description of the apartment that Arkadii shares with Adolph:

> "Ні, се неможливо! Та розуміється в такій конурі і при такому освітленню важко щось путяще сотворити!"
>
> Аркадій роздратовано опустив пензля й озирнувся на вікно: мов запорошена кісейна занавіса повис на ньому мутно-сірий туман вулиці. На кривих стінах мансарди і нечисленних предметах злиденної обстановки насіла волохата темрява (5).

> "No, it's impossible! And of course it's hard to create something decent in this dump and with this light!"
>
> Arkadii dropped his paintbrush in irritation and looked at the window. Muddy-grey fog from the street hung on it like a dusty curtain. Shaggy dusk covered the curved walls of the mansard and the couple of pieces of miserable furniture.

The life of Paris seems to be alien to exiles, who feel as though they do not belong to this place. This negative mood is conveyed in the portrayal of a city scene:

> Юрба теж спішить. Поспішають автомобілі, роздратовано кричать звощики сціпившись, поспішають ті, що йдуть вниз і ті, що в гору йдуть. Так ніби юрба комашок, яким закрито вхід до мурашнику. Немов забули сі люди двері домів своїх і змушені лишатися на вулиці, повні тривоги й неспокою (47).

> The crowd is also in a hurry. Cars are speeding; carters are shouting with irritation, people stoop—those who are going down and those who are going up. It looks like a swarm of ants that are barred from entering the anthill. It seems as though these people have forgotten what the doors of their homes look like and are forced to remain on the street full of anxiety and worry.

The local weather is also a source of irritation for the exiles. Earlier I mentioned how it affected Vynnychenko himself (cf. 67-68). In the novel Fenia grumbles about the inclement weather: "How can we go for a walk? It's so terrible outside. Is it snow or some kind of spittle? The weather! Europe! Just think: they boast about their warm climate, the bastards, they don't make stoves—is it warm if they themselves shiver like in a cellar" [Куди там гуляти! Погань така на дворі, чи то сніг, чи то плювки якісь? Погода! Європа! Подумаєш, носяться з своїм теплим кліматом, сволочі, печей не будують,—тепло, самі трусяться в льоху] (233). Interestingly, she does not specify Paris in this case but makes a generalization about all of Europe, even though there is a significant difference between, say, northern and southern France. But the point is that Fenia would be dissatisfied with the climate no matter where in Europe, as it symbolizes exile for her.

In contrast, the depiction of the homeland weather and landscape is imbued with bright colours. It also serves as a form of nostalgic memory of the past. Here is an interesting comparison between French and Ukrainian scenes:

> Справді, сніг падав рідкий, мокрий, важкий. Зажурено, наче насупившись, горіли ліхтарні,—дуже не приємно освітлювати сю сльоту. Перехожі поспішали,—у кожного напевне дома тепло й затишно, близька людина чекає з любов'ю. Еге, така погода навіть приємною може бути.
>
> А на Україні сніг—наче товстий килим з білого-білого пуху накрив цілу землю. Комори, голубятня, клуня в білих шапках, насунутих на самі очі. Біля кухні велика купа потовченого снігу з жовтими слідами вилитої води і помиїв. Дерева стоять важкі такі, поважні, їм тепер не можна розмахувати гіллям, треба сніг підтримувати. Сад зовсім інакший, ніж літом,—незнайомий, урочистий, суворий. Ні цвіркотіння, ні співів (234).

> Indeed, the falling snow was thin, wet, and heavy. Lanterns were burning worriedly, almost pouting—it was very unpleasant to illuminate this sleet. Passers-by were hurrying—it's probably warm and cozy in each of their homes and their dearest one is waiting for them with love. Well, even this kind of weather can be pleasant.
>
> But in Ukraine the snow looks like a thick carpet of very white down covering the ground. Store-houses, a pigeon-house, and a barn are wearing white hats pulled over their eyes. There is a large heap of trampled snow with yellow traces of spilled water and slops by the kitchen. The trees stand heavy and dignified; now they are not allowed to swing about with their branches because they have to support the snow. The garden is entirely different than in summer—unfamiliar, solemn, and stern. Not a chirp or song.

In *Rivnovaha* Vynnychenko portrays a different aspect of displacement—exile—and a different type of character—a revolutionary. Whereas artists could share their Bohemian interests with fellow artists from other countries and adapt more easily to the hostland (*Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, "Olaf Stefenzon), this appears to be more problematic for revolutionaries. At the beginning of their displacement they still have a positive attitude toward both the homeland and hostland ("Taina," "Taiemna pryhoda"). But with time, exiles are more frustrated with their long-lasting displacement and become psychologically divided persons uncertain of their future. Following "the law of equilibrium," the best way out for revolutionaries in *Rivnovaha* seems to be a return home even at the risk of facing repressions. This is the step taken by the main characters (Khoma, Tania, Fenia, and Mary), all of whom have a positive outlook. As Vynnychenko's correspondence indicates, to return home at any cost as the result of the pressure of long exile was his personal attitude toward his own displacement. In point of fact, a few years later, in 1914, Vynnychenko finished his novel; he and his wife Rosalia disguised themselves in peasant clothing and carrying false passports, returned illegally to Ukraine.

In terms of the revolutionaries' disillusionment and dividedness, *Rivnovaha* is a groundbreaking work that first signaled a crucial change of Vynnychenkian hero. To show this, it is helpful to draw parallels between Khoma and the main protagonists in the other major works of the period 1907-14, such as Myron Kupchenko (*Chesnist' z soboiu*, 1911) and Vadym Stel'mashenko (*Po-svii*, 1913 and *Bozhky*, 1914), to whom I also made references earlier (cf. 60-63, and 124-25). It is important to emphasize that chronologically they develop from a stoic Nietzschean-like (Kupchenko) individual to a lost and divided character (Khoma and Stel'mashenko).

Determination and superiority are probably Kupchenko's most salient characteristics in *Chesnist' z soboiu*. To convey this, the author repeatedly uses the metaphor of eyes that flash with fire: "But his eyes sharply, coldly, and with sparks of something hidden and burning scanned the faces of the assembled people" [Але очі йому гостро, холодно, з іскорками чогось захованого та пекучого бігали по обличчях зібраних] (81); "his eyes reflected the colours of the lamps and in the semi-darkness looked as though they were glittering" [(його) очі одсвічували барвами лямпадок і в півтьмі здавались виблискуючими] (190); "Myron's eyes flashed but he didn't move" [У Мирона блиснули очі, але він не рухнувся] (233). Interestingly, Dara, who left her husband to live with Kupchenko and follow his ideas, also possesses this feature: "Dara walked with her head down, frowning fiercely" [Дара йшла нахиливши голову, суворо стиснувши брови] (251). In *Rivnovaha* the female characters, though generally strong, seem less protected and resolute. Tania's weakness, for instance, is stressed in a rather ironic episode when she, a revolutionary, is not able to endure the look of her dead boyfriend Shurka and cuts off the rope with which he has just hung himself (258).

The revolutionary Vadym Stel'mashenko appears in two works—*Po-svii* and *Bozhky*, which were written shortly after *Rivnovaha*—in 1913 and 1914, respectively. The critic Valentyna Kharkhun makes the interesting observation that Stel'mashenko signifies the first disillusionment of Vynnychenko's heroes with socialist ideas and his submersion into loneliness and inwardness, unlike the Nietzschean-like Myron Kupchenko (62). "Stel'mashenko," in Kharkhun's opinion, "never departed from an existential circle of loneliness" (64), whereas Petro Zabolot'ko (*Zapovit bat'kiv*, 1913) was opposed to the entire world (65). My study, however, proposes that this submersion is already evident in the image of Khoma from *Rivnovaha*, a work that was quite neglected because of its foreign setting. Displacement, as I argue above, was the reason for Vynnychenko's personal transformation, and so it was for his heroes. Stel'mashenko further develops the image of a disillusioned revolutionary. It is interesting to note that Vynnychenko begins *Po-svii* with Stel'mashenko's banishment to Siberia for his revolutionary activity. But even among his fellow revolutionaries he cannot find mutual understanding of his revolutionary views on love and family and is disillusioned with revolutionary rhetoric. At the same time he suffers from the loss of former revolutionary ideals, for which he is also responsible. After his return to Ukraine Stel'mashenko looks entirely lost in society; Vynnychenko describes him as a recluse. The novel reveals the confrontation between the protagonist and society, as well as his family and difficulties that he encounters on his way to overcoming and adjusting to his new circumstances at home. At the end, Stel'mashenko becomes involved again in revolutionary activity and is convicted for this crime. Although *Po-svii* and *Bozhky* deal with the homeland theme, we may assume that it is a projection of Vynnychenko's own predicament of displacement, but merely shifted from the Parisian to the Siberian setting. In this case, however, the writer does not focus on his exile surroundings but quickly transfers his narrative to the homeland. Stel'mashenko's encounter with the homeland after years spent in Siberian exile likely parallels Vynnychenko's own drama of return from his European exile. Stel'mashenko's eventual imprisonment almost certainly prophesies the fate that would have befallen Vynnychenko upon his return. He would most certainly have been imprisoned if he had been caught by the police, if the revolution had not begun in 1917. It is worth noting that in *Zapovit bat'kiv* the main protagonist Zabolot'ko is also arrested and commences a new period of exile.

2.4.3. Reconciliation through Nostalgia

If there is a problem with returning home and exile is intolerable, the mechanism of nostalgia helps the displaced person to reconcile his anxieties. Nostalgia (Greek *nostos*—to return home; and *algia*—a painful condition) is a feeling that appears as time passes and a person ages. The material of nostalgia is the past, the "golden age" of childhood and, in more symbolic terms, a "lost paradise." The past is always personally experienced and of a very intimate nature. It is imbued with lyrical recollections and imaginary projections of familiar sights and experiences.

However, the main source for nostalgia is rooted in the present, which actualizes the past and makes it a manifestation of the present experience. But a Heraclitean paradox arises: when does the past become the past? Where is the line of demarcation between the past and present: a day, a month, a year, or a number of years? Fred Davis argues that this border cannot be defined strictly: "The ability to feel nostalgia for events in our past has less to do with how recent or distant these events are than with the way they contrast—or, more accurately, the way we make them contrast—with the events, moods, and dispositions of our present circumstances" (11-12).

In normal life nostalgia comes with age, usually in late adulthood and old age (ibid., 64). But it can also be the result of a sudden change in life conditions that makes the contrast between the past and present obvious. In Davis's opinion, "sudden alteration, sharp transition, or marked discontinuity in life experience" explains the phenomenon (2-3). Geographical displacement clearly fits this paradigm. Nostalgia is considered one of the most salient characteristics of displaced experience, defining sudden rupture with the native social and cultural environment and challenging the encounter with the hostland. While the individual is at home, time passes gradually and preserves a sense of continuity, so that the process is natural and not so painful. "When we are at home, we don't need to talk about it [nostalgia]," Svetlana Boym says (251).

The concept of nostalgia was coined by a Swiss physician, Johannes Hofer, in 1688 to define the homesickness of Swiss mercenaries who were away from home for a long time. First defined as a "disease," today nostalgia is mainly considered a protective mechanism that balances one's identity by connecting the past with the present. Andreea Ritivoi sees nostalgia as a "defence mechanism designed to maintain a stable identity by providing continuity among various stages in a person's life" (9). To "reflect on [human] nature and the social world through communication and language" is a distinctive human capacity that defines one's identity from a sociological point of view (Marshall, 294).

Obviously, with the rupture of established forms of communication and language that exists in the homeland, geographical displacement brings a challenge to this human capacity. Displacement, as I argue above, is a very prolific ground for an on-going process of the creation of identity on the basis of the encounter of different conditions—exile, émigré, and expatriate. This is a highly unstable process that may lead to discontinuity of one's life experience and, in Davis's opinion, can be the main threat that makes nostalgia protect one's identity: "In the clash of continuities and discontinuities with which life confronts us, nostalgia clearly attends more to the pleas for continuity, to the comforts of sameness and to the consolations of piety…" (33). "Discontinuities of too great a magnitude," the critic goes on to say, "can only give rise to chaos and psychosis; and it is precisely these states that nostalgia in its sometimes charming, sometimes pathetic way aims to arm us against" (50). In Milbauer's opinion, this implies a certain equilibrium between past and present, which exiles must reach in order to transcend their exile. "Unless such an equilibrium is achieved," the critic says, "tragedy is predictable" (54).

In studies on exile the concept of nostalgia has often been neglected or equated with similar concepts (e.g., melancholy) that allowed scholars to view exile only from the negative perspective of dislocation and loss. However, by using the concept developed in recent works by Davis, Boym, and Ritivoi, we can see the reconciling work of nostalgia, which helps to soften the bitterness of exile:

> …[T]he nostalgic feeling is infused with imputations of past beauty, pleasure, joy, satisfaction, goodness, happiness, love, and the like, in sum, any or several of the positive affects of being. Nostalgic feeling is almost never infused with those sentiments we commonly think of as negative—for example, unhappiness, frustration, despair, hate, shame, abuse (Davis, 14).

Speaking about Vynnychenko's displacement, one can see his unbearable condition and clear threats to the continuity of his identity. His escapist-like intention to migrate to Canada or some other distant place and the thought of suicide are especially indicative in this respect. Although Vynnychenko's personal nostalgia never left him in Europe and is evident from his correspondence with Chykalenko and his strong desire to return, or at least to "touch the ground," it is, at first glance, barely perceptible in his writings. He seems to be entirely preoccupied with contemporary intellectual discourse. His creative energy is directed to the present rather than to the past. Nostalgia and a longing for the past are elements hidden in the ideological labyrinths of his writings. Strictly speaking, nobody would call him a nostalgic writer. Moreover, as Davis argues, radicals are critical of nostalgia, considering it "a deliberately created, cleverly exploited obstacle on the path to reform or revolution" (108). We remember how Vynnychenko himself in his article "Sposterezhennia neprofesionala. Marksyzm i mystetstvo" (1913) spoke critically about writers who immersed themselves too deeply in their loneliness and self-contemplation (cf. 59). Nonetheless, it would be wrong to neglect feelings of nostalgia in Vynnychenko's work. The perspective of displacement gives us a theoretical clue to deconstructing Vynnychenko's texts and finding his constant need and willingness to actualize the past.

Davis's statement that art thrives on nostalgia seems incontestable:

> We need only reflect on the character of our aesthetic experience, on how often the poem, the story, the song, the picture "reminds us of" or "captures exactly" the way we felt then or "makes us feel sad for some lovely time and place we shall never see again." So frequently and uniformly does nostalgic sentiment seem to infuse our aesthetic experience that we can rightly begin to suspect that nostalgia is not only a feeling or mood that is somehow magically evoked by the art object but also a

> distinctive aesthetic modality in its own right, a kind of code or patterning of symbolic elements, which by some obscure mimetic isomorphism comes, much as in language itself, to serve as a substitute for the feeling or mood it aims to arouse (73).

In Vynnychenko's case, however, this is not explicit. Such episodes are dispersed throughout his works on revolutionary, artistic, and exile themes. Only his children's stories correspond purely to his nostalgia. In some sense, my attempt is a reconstruction. Using what Davis calls a "distinctive aesthetic modality," as point of reference, we take it as a conventional stance or attitude that is assumed by the writer toward his subject and embodied in certain formal features. Among them we distinguish lyrical prologues and passages, landscapes, climate descriptions, childhood memories, and realistic description of the homeland.

Lyricism is probably the most salient formal feature of nostalgic aesthetic modality. An initial association of the term with a song very appropriately indicates a speaker's subjective state with emphases on mood and feeling instead of rational thought. "Lyric speakers," as Abrams puts it, "may be represented as musing in solitude" (97). The lyrical aspect of a literary work invites us to read it as the writer's personal utterance, although it can be represented by an invented character. Vynnychenko's depiction of the native landscape, climate, and childhood experience is imbued with this sense of lyricism.

The story "Zina" (written in Geneva in 1908, published in 1909) is quite an indicative example in this respect. The story is actually about the revolutionary Zina and presents a revolutionary theme set in Ukraine. Zina plans to spring her fiancé Antyp from prison. But on her way to Antyp, who has begun a hunger strike, railway workers go on strike. Zina stays to support the strike, even though she desperately needs to continue her journey by train. Fortunately, after a week of the strike Zina arrives and frees Antyp.

The narrator is the person who assists Zina and introduces a lyrical tone into the narrative. He is depicted as a slow and judicious man, for whom haste is a totally extraneous feature. It is shown, for instance, by the halting way in which he speaks: "Listen, Zina, what do you think?...Doesn't it seem to you that…if…couldn't I stay home today?..." I coughed again. "Couldn't I stay home?...I have work to do… [А слухайте, Зіно, як вам здається, чи не той... чи не міг би я сьогодня... той...—Я мусив ще прокашлятись.—...Лишитись, розумієте, дома... У мене, знаєте, робота...] (475).[80] The narrator's slowness is also emphasized through the contrast with the very agile and romantic Zina. Here is how he describes her:

> І от, уявіть ви собі: ця дівчина щоранку влітала до мене в кімнату, нашвидку струсювала мою руку, бризкала в усі кутки сміхом та словами, хапала мене за рукав і з такою хапливістю витягала на вулицю, ніби в тому будинку починалась пожежа (475).
>
> And now, imagine: every morning this girl flew into my room, shook my hand in a slapdash manner, and filled all the corners of my room with words and laughter. She would grab me by the sleeve and drag me out to the street with such speed, it was as though my house were on fire.

Although the narrator's temper does not seem to resemble that of the author, who was rather hot-tempered and impulsive, there is an episode in the story, which allows us to speak about its lyrical tone and the narrator's affinity with the author. This is the lyrical prologue at the very beginning of the story, in which the narrator introduces himself in the following way:

---

[80] All the translations from "Zina" are by Theodore S. Prokopov (Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. "Zina." In his *Selected Short Stories*. Wakefield, New Hampshire: Longwood Academic, 1991, pp. 76-85).

Ви уявіть собі: я родився в степах. Ви розумієте, добре розумієте, що то значить „в степах"? Там, перш усього, немає хапливості. Там люди, наприклад, їздять волами. Запряжуть у широкий, поважний віз пару волів, покладуть надію на бога і їдуть. Воли собі ступають, земля ходить круг сонця, планети творять свою путь, а чоловік лежить на возі і їде. Трохи засне, підкусить трохи, пройдеться з батіжком наперед, підожде волів, крикне задумливо „гей!" і знов собі поважно піде уперед.

А навкруги теплий степ та могили, усе степ та могили. А над могилами вгорі кругами плавають шуліки; часами, як по дроту, в ярок спуститься чорногуз, м'яко, поважно, не хапаючись. Там нема хапливості. Там кожний знає, що скільки не хапайся, а все тобі буде небо, та степ, та могили. І тому чоловік собі їде, не псуючи крові хапливістю, і, нарешті, приїжджає туди, куди йому треба.

Отже, я виріс у тих степах, з тими волами, шуліками, задуманими могилами. Вечорами я слухав, як співали журавлі біля криниць у ярах, а удень ширина степів навівала сум безкрайності. В тих теплих степах виробилась кров моя і душа моя (474-75).

Imagine: I was born in the steppes. Do you understand—do you clearly understand?—what it means, "in the steppes"? First of all, there is no haste. People there, for example, use oxen for transportation. They yoke the oxen to a solid, broad wagon, put their trust in God, and off they go. The oxen walk, the earth rotates around the sun, the other planets move in their orbits, and the man lies in his cart, and moves slowly along. He falls asleep for a while, eats a little, walks ahead of the oxen with his little whip, yells "hey!" pensively, and then continues moving forward.

And all around him are the warm steppes and grave mounds, nothing but steppes and graves. And high above the grave mounds hawks are swimming. Sometimes a big, heavy stork descends in a dignified manner into a valley, softly and slowly. There is no hurry there. There, every creature knows that no matter how much it hurries, there will always be more sky, steppes, and grave mounds. So men, too, drive slowly, without getting their nerves on edge by hurrying, and finally they arrive where they need.

I was raised in the steppes with those oxens, hawks, and pensive grave mounds. In the evenings I would listen to the pulleys of wells creaking in the valley;

> and during the day, the breadth of the steppes imbued me with the sadness of infinity. In those warm steppes my blood and my soul were created.

On the one hand I agree with Kaczurowskyj (2002, 144) that this lyrical prologue helps to reveals the character of the narrator—this is a function of landscape in a literary text. But taking into account Vynnychenko's other lyrical use of landscape (e.g., in "Taina," *Rivnovaha*), I would suggest that it also expresses his nostalgic feeling for the homeland, which overlaps with the former function, as shown in the above quotation. In one of his letters to Chykalenko Vynnychenko remembers the steppe with devotion: "If I could at least take a quick look at this 'estate.' To walk in the steppe and trample the dry steppe grass" [Коли б мені хоч одним оком подивитись на цей 'заклад' [Chykalenko's estate]. У степах походити, потоптати сухої степової трави] (11 December 1913). The native landscape is associated with a place where one is born and belongs. For Vynnychenko this is the steppe, which is intimately connected with his past and in general symbolizes Ukraine. Significantly, the image of the steppe repeatedly recurs in his works (e.g., "Kuz' ta Hrytsun'" [Kuz' and Hrytsun'], 1911). As late as in 1925, in Paris Vynnychenko planned to focus on the "poetics of the steppes" in his work. He noted in his diary: "Theme: a Ukrainian in Paris, a man from the steppes in the centre of human civilization. The poetry of the steppes and space—and stone streets" (2: 625, 23 September 1925).

The Dnipro River is another place that Vynnychenko's characters either recollect or where they stay or return to it. Tania in *Rivnovaha* returns to it in her imagination as a relief from the hardships of exile (cf. 184). In the story "Istoriia Yakymovoho budynku" (1912) the protagonist, the painter Vasyl', is in a lyrical mood when he settles in a house near the Dnipro River. This is his studio, located in an attic of an old house that overlooks the beautiful landscape of the river:

> Замість ліжка у мене був гамак, прив’язаний під бантинами. З мене сього було досить, навіть не досить, а далеко ліпше, ніж ліжко. Гамак висів якраз під діркою. Ввечері я завжди міг бути на одинці з небом, темним і таємним. Завжди вітер, весняний квітневий вітер, ніс мені з-за Дніпра усі пахощі, які рождалися на довгих його луках (5-6).
>
> Instead of a bed, I had a hammock bound to the joists. This was enough for me, even more than enough, it was far better than a bed. The hammock hung right underneath a hole. In the evening I could always be alone with the dark and mysterious sky. The wind, the spring April wind, always brought from the Dnipro River all the scents produced in its long meadows.

Vynnychenko’s diary also contains a reference to the Dnipro River as a kind of holy place. Here is how he describes his encounter with the river after he returned home from exile in 1914:

> Ми з Розою лежимо на м’якому, ніжному, як тільце дитини, піску Дніпра. Заходить сонце, хмаринки над обрієм рожево-малинові. Над нами ласкаво, привітно шелестить блискуче, як полаковане, листя білокорих осокорів. Іменно, радість і хвилюючий захват переживаємо ми в цей момент! Коли ми прийшли на пустинний берег цього острова, коли на нас війнув дніпровий вітер, змішаний з запахами гарячого сухого сонця, осоки, листя і піску, ми трохи не завищали від щастя. Ця якась свята пустельність дніпрових жовтих пісків з ріденькими кущиками, це широченне небо над нами,—в них страшенні чари! Я плачу й дивлюсь на сивувато-зелений обшир по тім боці, що тягнеться в неосяжну далечінь на обрії. А на обрії малесенькі, як зелені прищики, могили... Вода в Дніпрі жовта, як перестояний чай, любовно хлюпочеться маленькими короткими хвилями об чистий ніжний пісок берега. Широчінь води поширює душу (1: 63-64, 10 June 1914).
>
> Rosa and I are lying on the sand of the Dnipro, tender like a child’s body. The sun is setting, and the little clouds over the horizon are coloured pink and raspberry.

> Above us the shiny, as though varnished, leaves of black poplars with white bark are rustling above us in a friendly, welcoming way. We feel just joy and trembling ecstasy at this moment! We almost screamed with joy when we came to the deserted shore of this island and when the wind from the Dnipro, mixed with the fragrance of the hot, dry sun, black poplar, the leaves and sand, gusted at us. This is a kind of holy wilderness of the Dnipro's yellow sands with sparse bushes and this huge sky above us—they have a terrible charm! I'm crying and looking at a grayish-green expanse across the river, which stretches boundlessly toward the horizon. And on the horizon are tiny graves, like green pimples…The water of the Dnipro, yellow, like overbrewed tea, is splashing merrily with small, short waves against the clean and delicate sand of the shore. The breadth of the water expands the soul.

Interestingly, one can find this intriguing scene of the first encounter with the Dnipro in *Khochu*, the novel mentioned above. Probably, no episode betrays Khalepa's lyrical mood of return better than his trip to the riverbank. He addresses the Dnipro as though it is a grandfather, almost a deity:

> Знову були місячні ночі, й Халепа часто ходив до Дніпра. Там було тихо й журно. Сріблясто-голуба широка стьожка, як у генерала, була перетягнута через усі могутні груди дідуся. Щось глухо гомоніло туди далі,—ще поріг. Удень там вода, як пінясте мереживо, обкладає облизані виступи скель і водоспадами кидається вниз. Чайки з веселими, злорадними криками гасають над мереживом і б'ються грудьми об воду. ...Вночі чомусь хороший сором і невиразна, кличуча кудись тривога хвилюють душу. Дідусю Дніпро, поможи й принеси те, до чого рветься душа! (294)

> There were moonlit nights again, and Khalepa often went to the Dnipro River. It was quiet and mournful there. A wide silvery blue ribbon, like a general's, was stretched across mighty chests of grandfather Dnipro. Something was thumping dully further on—that was a rapid. During the day there water like a foamy lace covers the smooth ledges of rocks and hurtles down like waterfalls. Seagulls with merry and malevolent cries rush above the lace and smash against the water with their breasts. …For some reason at night a feeling of beautiful shame and vague disquiet calling

> somewhere moves the soul. Grandfather Dnipro, help me, bring me that to which my soul aspires!

The imagery of the steppe and the Dnipro River is important not only because these are objects of personal memory, but they are also symbols of Ukraine, combining individual and collective voices. Christopher Ely considers landscape a form "to formulate an inspirational vision of the nation" (8). Examining the role of landscapes in the works of Russian artists of the nineteenth century, he argues that "landscape imagery still remains an important part of the imaginative process by which individuals connect themselves to the greater national collective" (26). The images of the steppe and the Dnipro River are ingrained in Ukrainian culture and history and were addressed widely in national myths, folk narratives, and artistic works (e.g., Taras Shevchenko, Ievhen Malaniuk, and David Burliuk). The steppe and the mighty Dnipro are not simply objects but symbols representing the homeland, both physical and spiritual. Taras Shevchenko asked in his poem "Zapovit" [Testament] (1841) to be buried there:

> I desire to be buried
> Where the Dnipro's running by.
> On this land of steppes and cherries
> Bury me when I die.
> [Translated by Anna Revchoun]

By the same token, these two images for Vynnychenko are holy lands and shrines where he can always return and feel at home. Displacement and distance deprived Vynnychenko of physical contact with native landscapes but enhanced their spiritual significance—something akin to the way dispersed Jews imagined the Holy Land. This is a kind of imaginary pilgrimage that seeks a spiritual connection with the homeland, healing, and completion. The holiness of the Dnipro River can be also connected with water as a life-giving substance and with water rituals during pilgrimages, which symbolize cleansing and purification (Clift and Clift, 72-3). The image of grave mounds in "Zina" gives the author the right to claim a territory and acquire a sense of belonging.

Although "Istoriia Yakymovoho budynku" deals with moral issues within the context of family relationships (which I address above, p. 131), we can see another significant tendency in it—a lyrical mood and nostalgic feelings. This tendency is represented by Vasyl', the narrator of the story, who, to a great extent, articulates an authorial voice. As in "Zina," Vynnychenko begins with a lyrical prologue. Vasyl's encounter with his "childhood friend" Iakym, invokes early recollections, accompanied by visual, aural, and olfactory sensations:

> Дощ тарабанив по залізу покрівлі, старий порох і глина, намочені дощем, пряно пахли. Але було так затишно, так сумно! І згадувались дитячі часи, коли ми так само, бувало, вдвох сиділи у дощ десь на горищі. Тоді ми туди забирались для всяких таємничих і злочинних справ,—курити, робити патрони, ховати нашу дитячу нелегальщину.
>
> І раніше Яким не любив "поезій спогадів". А тепер навіть сам зачинав їх. Сидячи на товстому сволоку, покритому плахтою, він задумливо слухав шум дощу і чогось посміхався... Коли ж дощ проходив, ми знов одпинали "штору" і сонце прожогом веселим вогнем заливало гамак, мольберт, бантини, паутини. Кутки ставали жовтими і видно було якісь старі коші, поломані відра, укритий порохом одинокий черевик, в якому, мабуть, сходились по ночах миші. А в дірку з Дніпра лився мокрий дух дощу, молодої трави, розігрітий сонцем, лився гомін города, гудки пароходів, дзвінки трамваїв, крики, обірвані шматки катеринки, гавкання собак (6-7).

> The rain drummed on the iron roof, and old dust and clay wet from the rain smelled of spices. But it was so cozy and so sad! And we remembered our childhood when just like this, we sat in the attic when it rained. We would get together there for all sorts of secret and criminal things—to smoke, make cartridges, and hide our illegal children's stuff.

> Before, Iakym didn't like the "poetry of recollections." But now even he would initiate it. Sitting on a thick beam covered with a plakhta,[81] he would listen pensively to the sound of the rain and smile at something... When the rain passed, we would open up the "curtain," and the sun would rapidly pour onto the hammock, easel, joists, and spider webs with a merry fire. The corners would turn yellow, and you could see old baskets, broken buckets, and a shoe covered with dust, in which perhaps mice gathered in the nights. From the Dnipro through the hole flowed the wet scent of the rain and young grass; and the noise of the city, heated by the sun, and steamboats hooting, streetcars ringing, shouts, snatches of tunes from a barrel-organ, and dogs barking.

The specific role of Vasyl' in representing the author's displacement becomes more evident later in the story. After a brief stay in Iakym's house he leaves for Italy to study painting. His detailed description of Italian sights convinces us in an authentic literary material: "From Florence I went to Pisa, Milan, Rome, and Naples. Everywhere I wandered around museums, churches, and galleries and was filled with them. I dreamed of frescoes, peeling walls, and long corridors with niches in which figures with broken arms stood" [З Фльоренції я поїхав в Пізу, Міляно, Рим, Неаполь. Скрізь я тинявся по музеях, церквах, галереях і весь був повний ними. Мені снились фрески, полуплені стіни, довгі коридори з нішами, в яких стоять постаті з одбитими руками] (49-50). As noted earlier, Vynnychenko himself traveled through such Italian cities as (Florence, Genoa, Sestri Levante, and Cavi di Lavogna) in 1911. In his diary he left a number of vivid descriptions of these places. Here is how he depicts the view of Florence:

> Сиджу на горі, внизу білими камінчиками розсипано вілли Фльоренції. Бугриста й поламана далечінь легкою блакитною мрякою затягнулася. Похоже, як курець пустить дим по рукаву і він стелиться сизими волокнистими хмарками. Маслини сивими круглими плямами вкрили ближчий схил гори. Білі,

---

[81] A kind of skirt rarely used nowadays.

> ясноблискучі стіни будинків викликають в мені знову тоску (1: 32, 1 February 1911).

> I am sitting on a hill. Down below the villas of Florence are scattered like small white pebbles. Light and blue fog dropped its curtain on the uneven and distorted distance. It looks as though a smoker has exhaled puffs of smoke that trail along his sleeve, and it hovers in warm grey and fibrous clouds. Olives covered the nearest hillside with gray, round spots. The white and brilliantly shiny walls of the buildings arouse my yearning once again.

Significantly, in the last sentence the writer expresses his longing for the homeland, inspired by "the white and brilliantly shiny walls of the buildings," which is very typical of the Ukrainian rural landscape.

Although Vasyl''s character represents an expatriate-artist who went to Europe driven by art, at the same time he is depicted as a person who experiences a strong sense of nostalgia that distinguishes him from other artists (e.g., Kanevych in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* or the narrator in "Olaf Stefenzon"). Besides lyrical recollections of the past and landscapes, the native land's climate and weather also become objects of nostalgia. Here is how Vasyl' begins to express his longing for the homeland after his short stay in Italy, which he initially enjoyed: "Shrovetide was coming in Russia,[82] people were riding on sleighs, getting together to eat pancakes. But at this time I was in Naples sweating from the heat and yearning for snow" [В Росії вже підходила масляна, їздили на санках, збірались їсти блини. А я в Неаполі в сей час упрівав од спеки і мріяв за снігом] (50). The difference in climate is the main device by which Vynnychenko conveys Vasyl's nostalgia:

> Минуло ще місяців три. Італія почала вже надокучати мені...

---

[82] Vynnychenko meant the Russian Empire.

> Приходу весни я не помітив: італійський клімат не знає зимньої туги за весняним цвітом. І тому я скучав за духом розталого снігу, за жовто-зеленою травичкою під тинами, де гріє сонце. Я скучив за вечірніми приморозками, коли зорі на небі великі, чіткі і хочеться од невідомої радости насунуть городовику на самий ніс його "хвормену фуражку".
>
> Одним словом, у мене почалася *nostalgie*, нудьга за рідним краєм (51-52).

> Three more months have passed. Italy has begun to bore me...
>
> I didn't notice that spring had come. The Italian climate doesn't know winter's longing for spring blossoms. That's why I missed the spirit of thawed snow, yellow and green grass near fences where the sun is warm. I missed the evening frost, when the stars are large and clear in the sky and from some unknown joy you want to yank a policeman's peaked cap all the way down to his nose.
>
> In a word, I have begun to feel *nostalgie*,[83] a longing for my native country.

The native climate can actually be considered a part of the landscape and as such it represents the natural environment in which one grew up. The change of climate often affects a person's psychological state and may arouse nostalgic feelings about the past. This, as we saw above (pp. 189-90) was explicitly revealed in *Rivnovaha*. Here we can see from the above quotation how nostalgia for the native climate triggers olfactory associations ("the spirit of thawed snow") and visual ("yellow and green grass" and "the stars…in the sky"). Significantly, the protagonist himself emphasizes his state of nostalgia.

In his letters Vynnychenko often recollects the native climate with pleasure: "They write that the spring is beautiful in Ukraine, so much so that my heart begins to ache" [А з України пишуть, що там чудова весна, у мене ж аж груди болять] (28 March 1913). At the same time he contrasts it with the bad weather in Europe. He left Geneva because the fog in that city made him neurotic and gave him writers' block (27

---

[83] Vynnychenko used the Latin *nostalgie* in his Ukrainian original.

February and 30 May 1908). The rain in Paris also annoyed him, so he traveled to Italy to stay for some time in a sunny climate (28 March 1913). As we saw, Vynnychenko gives this option to his characters in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*. When the Kanevych family fails to make this journey, their child dies (cf. 83). Ely notes such a contrast in Gogol's depiction of his native Ukrainian landscapes, with its bright and romantic tones and "dim view of northern, Great Russian landscape" (98). Such contrasts play a role in "Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku," as well as in *Rivnovaha*. In "Olaf Stezenzon" the main protagonist also experiences the gloomy weather of Paris. But as a displaced modernist writer, he does not express his nostalgia for the homeland and is more preoccupied with the artistic life of the city. A displaced person values the native landscape and climate above all as symbols of his/her imaginary return to the homeland and to the past, as Fenia did it in *Rivnovaha* (cf. 190-91). Bad weather is a sign of their discontent.

One of the most remarkable forms of nostalgia is a return to one's childhood. Andreea Ritivoi refers to Kant, who considers the loss of childhood a universal source of nostalgia (170). A return to one childhood sustains one's identity, and the experience of the past may well serve to actualize it for the needs of the present. Nostalgia for childhood, as I mentioned above, usually comes with aging. However, nostalgia for childhood on the part of a 29-year-old writer is really extraordinary and signals a significant change in his life's condition. It can be motivated, as we argued above, by a geographical displacement. "The basic response to such conditions [of exile]—in Gurr's view—is a search for identity, the quest for a home, through self-discovery or self-realization, [which may lead to a] search for a past, a cultural heritage" (14). The critic develops his idea and concludes that such a voyage into childhood may bring a sense of stability and rootedness: "…[T]he exile is still more deliberately concerned to identify or even create a stasis, because home is a static concept rooted in the unalterable circumstances of childhood" (23-24). To return to the happy days of his childhood and to enjoy the work of memory in a situation of isolation finds suitable ground in Vynnychenko's case.

During 1907-14 Vynnychenko wrote two children's stories, "Kumediia z Kostem" (1909)[84] and "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" (Paris in 1912). The writer used images of children in other works (*Memento* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*).[85] But the latter served only as props to challenge his heroes. Before I began studying Vynnychenko's works through the prism of displacement, I was of the opinion that the two stories "Kumediia z Kostem" and "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" seemed to be entirely out of place for a writer who had never before focused on child characters. In fact, these two stories are totally different kinds of works, in which children are the main characters and their psychology is revealed in depth.

Various aspects—didactic, philosophical, and psychological—of Vynnychenko's children's stories have been addressed in recent studies (I. Bratus', T. Nehodenko, A. Horban'). Horban', for instance, argues that they convey the world of adults by raising philosophical issues of freedom, power, good, and evil. Bratus' (38) and Nehodenko (191) explain Vynnychenko's children's stories simply as an expression of the writer's love of children. The latter statement is quite vague. Much later, during his stay in Paris in 1929, when Vynnychenko was asked by the Ukrainian publishing house DVU (Derzhavne vydavnytstvo Ukrainy) [State Publishing House of Ukraine] to write a story about children in Western Europe, Vynnychenko advised them that a French writer could do this better (*Shchodennyk*, 20 March 1929). Indeed, to write about Ukrainian and French children is not the same thing. Vynnychenko's children's stories are too personal and lyrical to be simply a manifestation of his ideological constructs—so typical of this period. To write about Ukrainian children meant, in fact, to project the writer's own childhood, to retrieve his memory of the past and to perform a kind of homecoming. I would like to examine here "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" as the projection of his childhood experience, in which displacement can be viewed as the real reason behind his nostalgic mood.

---

[84] It is not known where Vynnychenko wrote this story.

[85] Later he will use the motif of children in the novel *Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelia* (1917).

"Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" is Vynnychenko's best known story about children, which went through numerous reprints. Evidence that the story is based on autobiographical material may be found in recent studies whose authors observe the resemblance of the main protagonist Fed'ko to Vynnychenko's own childhood:

> The recollections of the writer's relatives show that the story about trouble-making Fed'ko, written in 1912 in emigration, contains autobiographical elements. It concerns both the details and circumstances of the author's childhood and his protagonist and features of character of the real person and literary hero... The recollections of Vynnychenko's mother, noted by the writer's wife, provide a number of details that "duplicate" the story about Fed'ko
> (qt. in Panchenko, http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/p2.shtml#2.2.%20).

Fed'ko is a trouble-maker who likes to be a leader among children and invents different pranks:

> Це був чистий розбишака-халамидник.
>
> Не було того дня, щоб хто-небудь не жалівся на Федька: там шибку з рогатки вибив; там синяка підбив своєму «закадишному» другові; там перекинув діжку з дощовою водою, яку збирали з таким клопотом.

> Наче біс який сидів у хлопцеві! Усі діти як діти,—граються, бавляться тихо, лагідно. Федькові ж, неодмінно, щоб битися, щоб що-небудь перевернути догори ногами. Спокій був його ворогом, з яким він боровся на кожному місці (304).

> He was a complete bully boy and trouble-maker.
>
> Not a day would pass without someone complaining about Fed'ko: he would break a window with a slingshot; give a bruising to his 'good' friend; or overturn a barrel with rainwater that had been collected with much trouble.
>
> It seemed as though there was a devil in the boy! Children are children—they play quietly, gently. But Fed'ko always needs to fight or turn something upside down. Peace was his enemy, which he always fought in every place.

But even though he is a trouble-maker, Fed'ko cherishes honesty above all. His main conflict is based on his relationship with Tolia, the son of a nobleman. Tolia is depicted as dishonest and a liar. Racing on an ice floe, he loses his way and nearly drowns. Fed'ko shows his courage and rescues him. However, Tolia lies and says that Fed'ko pushed him on the ice floe, which caused the accident. While rescuing Tolia, Fed'ko catches cold from the icy water and dies. Trouble-making (provocativeness) and aspiration to honesty are probably Vynnychenko's most intrinsic characteristics, which manifested themselves during his adulthood (best revealed in his moral principle of 'honesty with oneself').

The images of Fed'ko's father and mother are also autobiographical. In the story the father is presented as a strict but honest person. He punishes his son for his pranks by beating him with a belt. But afterwards he rewards Fed'ko with pocket money for admitting his wrongdoing (310). In contrast, the mother places her maternal instincts over honesty and reveals her low self-esteem in her relationships with upper-class people, like Tolia's parents. She is opposed to rewarding Fed'ko with money and calls him a "peasant's son" (muzhychyi syn) who should not play with children of noblemen (311). It is known that Vynnychenko had a more problematic relationship with his mother than with his father. This difference between father and mother is clearly revealed in *Bozhky* where Stel'mashenko's father represents order and honesty and his mother—maternal instincts that rationalize any moral transgressions on the part of her children.

Vynnychenko's desire to contemplate his childhood in the story is revealed through such elements as realistic description, children's activities, landscape and weather, songs, and a lyrical mood. The portrayal of the past may require specific details, generated by the drive to recreate and preserve the past exactly as it was. In "Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku" this is, for instance, a boy's "peaked cap" (cf. 209). In terms of artistic conventions, this corresponds to a realistic style. Davis even uses the term "nostalgic hyperrealism"—an "almost obsessive realism that strains to recapture exactly, in minute and exquisite detail, how objects looked then, how people spoke and dressed then, and so forth" (88). On the contrary, there could be an opposite tendency toward symbolic devices in works that are not nostalgic (e.g., *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, "Olaf Stefenzon," and later *Soniachna mashyna*). In "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" Vynnychenko pays attention to various sights in the village: an unpaved street, where horses always get stuck (304), a steam mill (317), and a cross on the Church of the Epiphany (317). There were small things that children found on the street during a thunderstorm: nails, horse-shoes, and other metal objects. Fed'ko also found five kopecks (313).

Children's activities—making little sand houses (304-305), flying a kite (305-8), sailing paper boats (315) and racing on ice floes (315-328) (in "Kumediia z Kostem," this is smoking)—impress with their detailed description and lyrical mood. Here is how the author portrays the building of sand houses:

> Ліплять хатки з піску. Перед будинком, де жив Федько, була незабрукована вулиця і там завжди грузли в піску коні. Після дощу цей пісок ставав липким і вогким—для будування хаток нема краще. Поставиш ногу, обкладеш її піском і виймай потихеньку. От і хатка. Хто хоче, може навіть димаря приробити. Коло хати можна тин виліпити, а за тином натикати сінинок—і сад є. А між хатками іде вулиця. Можна в гості ходити одне до одного (304).
>
> They [the children] are building houses out of sand. In front of the house where Fed'ko lived was an unpaved street, and horses always got stuck there in the sand. After a rainfall the sand would become sticky and damp—there was nothing better for building houses. Place your foot, cover it with sand, and pull it out gradually. There's your house. You could also build a chimney, if you wanted. Next to the house you can make a fence, and stick sticks of straw behind the fence—and you have a garden. And a street runs between the houses. You can visit each other.

It would be problematic for a writer who had no personal experience of such activities to write this way.

Native landscapes and other visual scenes appear in the writer's imagination. The scene of a thunderstorm is the most picturesque in the story:

> Надворі буря, дощ ллється з неба такими патьоками, наче там тисячі Федьків перекинули тисячу діжок з водою. Хмари аж сині, кошлаті, так і розрізують їх зеленяві блискавки. Грім блискає з такою силою, що аж посуд дзвенить у шафах...
>
> На вулиці, в самому потоці, під дощем, мокрі, без шапок бредуть Федько, Стьопка і Васько. Вони позакачували штанці аж до живота, пацають ногами, сміються, щось, видно, кричать. Їм весело і любо! Вода, мабуть, тепла, як душ у бані, так і обливає їх. Ось Федько підставляє лице під дощ, ловить краплі ротом. Які у них смішні мокрі голови!...

> Хмари над ними такі страшні, що дивитись моторошно, а їм те якраз і мило—дощ, значить, ще довго буде (312-313).

> There is a thunderstorm outside, and the rain pours from the sky in such streams, it seems as thousand thousands of Fed'kos have overturned a thousand barrels of water. Blue and shaggy clouds are being cut through by greenish lightning. Thunder roars with such force that dishes are clinking in the cupboards…
>
> Wet and without caps, Fed'ko, Stiopka and Vas'ko are walking beneath these streams of rain. They rolled their trousers up to their belly-buttons, splashing with their feet, laughing, and shouting something. They are joyful and merry! The water pouring over them is probably warm as a shower. All of a sudden Fed'ko lifts his face to the rain and catches drops with his mouth. What funny wet heads they have!...
>
> The clouds are so frightful above them that it is terrifying to look at them, but they are happy—it means the rain will last a long time.

The gloomy, terrifying scene of the thunderstorm is, in fact, transformed into a very lyrical scene of children's carelessness and mirth. This lyricism is further strengthened by the scene of the children's singing:

> Ось вони пританцьовують, мабуть, співають:
>
> *Іди, іди, дощику,*
> *Цебром,*
> *Цебром-цебрицею*
> *Над нашою пшеницею*
>
> І дощ іде їм на голову, на плечі, на руки. Сорочки поприлипали до тіла, потік біжить-біжить, грім тріщить (313-14).

> They are dancing and maybe singing:
>
> *Fall rain, fall,*
> *Like from a bucket,*
> *Like from a million buckets*
> *Right onto our wheat*
>
> And the rain falls on their heads, shoulders, and arms. Their shirts have stuck to their bodies, the stream runs, and the thunder roars.

We saw a similar function of a song in "Taina" (cf. 155-56). In contrast, Vynnychenko's other works either do not have musical passages at all or they are of a different kind and serve a different purpose. For instance, in *Rivnovaha* characters sing a revolutionary song (cf. 182). In *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* Snizhynka sings a French song (cf. 92). Significantly, the song will be the main expression of nostalgic feeling in the collection of stories about children, entitled *Namysto* (written during 1922-1929, published in 1930), in which the titles of all eight stories are taken from Ukrainian folk songs and their themes are developed in a literary form.[86] References to songs will be also present in highly nostalgic episodes from his last work, the novel *Slovo za toboiu, Staline* (1950).

In Davis's opinion, whatever the negative childhood, nostalgia transforms it by the power of imagination into positive heritage (14). Vynnychenko's difficult childhood, when he experienced class (peasant) and national (Ukrainian) enmity, is common knowledge (Panchenko 1997a). Even though "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" and "Kumediia z Kostem" depict children's tragic deaths and adults' intolerant attitudes to the children, these works are positively charged with nostalgic recollections of the past. Unlike Vynnychenko's works on revolutionary themes, there is no ideology and no politics in his stories about children—just recollections of adventures from his childhood. Certainly, readers will find social or moral issues, but these elements are not emphasized. Children of different social strata play together. It is their parents who are opposed to their contacts. This kind of transformation of a negative past into a positive memory was experienced, for instance, by Eva Hoffman, who spent her childhood as a Jew in communist Poland. Remarkably, she calls this chapter in her book "Paradise":

---

[86] They are the following: "Viiut' vitry, viiut' buini" [The Wild Winds Blow], "Stelysia barvinku, nyzen'ko" [Creep, Periwinkle, Low, Low], "Za Sybirom sontse skhodyt'" [The Sun Rises beyond Siberia], "Oi, vypyla, vykhylyla" [Hey, I Drank to the Bottom], "Ta nemaie hirsh nikomu" [And It Couldn't Be Worse for Anyone], "Hei, khto v lisi, obizvysia" [Hey, in the Forest, Can You Hear Me], "Hei, ne spyt'sia" [Hey, I Don't Want to Sleep], and "Hei, chy pan, chy propav" [Hey, All or Nothing].

> No, I'm no patriot, nor was I ever allowed to be. And yet, the country of my childhood lives within me with a primacy that is a form of love. It lives within me despite my knowledge of our marginality, and its primitive, unpretty emotions. It is blind and self-deceptive of me to hold on to its memory? I think it would be blind and self-deceptive not to. All it has given me is the world, but that is enough. It has fed me language, perceptions, sounds, the human kind. It has given me the colors and the furrows of reality, my first loves (74).

Another striking example is found in the works of the Hungarian writer, Imre Kertesz, the winner of the Nobel Prize in literature for 2002. In his works (e.g., *Fateless*, 1975; *Fiasco*, 1988; *Kaddish for a Child not Born*, 1990) he refers to his adolescent experiences in Auschwitz and Buchenwald as an important value in his life.

Vynnychenko will resume his interest in children's themes only in the 1920s, during his next displacement.

In summary, I have discussed displacement as an intrinsic characteristic of Modernism, which created a new type of writer—traveler and expatriate—who enjoy his/her stay abroad. These writers, being dislocated and alienated, are able to negotiate their émigré or exile status by keeping a close eye on the homeland either through active participation in the literary process or nostalgia. Despite social hardships and spiritual calamities, displacement offered advantages of geographical movements, communication, and opportunities for intellectual growth and education—all of which predispose a person to an exchange of ideas and a broader vision. Utilizing contemporary modernist ideas in philosophy and art (e.g., Marxism, Nietzscheanism, Bergsonianism, and symbolism, etc), Vynnychenko, with his ostentatious provocativeness and artistic talent, contributed significantly to the intellectual and literary discourse of his country during 1907-1914, the period in which he was genuinely creative, and which led to his becoming the most acclaimed writer of his time. His travels and expatriate status opened up *fin de siecle* Europe and its rich cultural traditions with its intellectual quests, artistic experimentations, preoccupation with beauty, Bohemian way of life, and individual freedom (e.g., *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and "Olaf Stefenzon"). Vynnychenko's long stay abroad and lack of vivid impressions resulted also in displacement from his native social and cultural environment and led to a shift in his literary career from short realistic stories to dramas and novels of ideas with conventional settings. This gave him a sense of detachment from the homeland and the perspective of distance, which helped the writer to observe his native country from a new, unvisited perspective. His numerous conflicts with his readership and critics stimulated his fervour to prove his rightness, but at the same time reinforced his alienation from the homeland. The impossibility of return and uncertainty for the future aroused his exilic feelings, prompting Vynnychenko to look at his encounters with the hostland. With time they developed from quite an optimistic mood of a lonely and contemplative revolutionary ("Taina") to the unbearable condition of displacement (*Rivnovaha*). This was counterbalanced by nostalgia, which helped the writer to ease his feelings of uprootedness and sustain his identity, connecting his past with the present (e.g., "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" and other stories). However, Vynnychenko's encounter with the hostland was quite minimal and limited to artistic life, as the writer found himself tightly bound to his homeland's social, political, and moral problems, as well as the opportunity to publish his works and introduce radical changes into society.

CHAPTER THREE

THE SECOND DISPLACEMENT, 1920-1925

> *Vynnychenko's final emigration made him a totally different man*
> (Volodymyr Panchenko)

The 1920s signified a new shift in Vynnychenko's life and literary career. The beginning of the new displacement, which would be final and last for more than thirty years, deepened his psychological dividedness, feeling of uprootedness, and uncertainty for the future—all that had already surfaced during his stay in Europe from 1907-14 but had now reached its apogee. Despite the hardships of the first displacement, Vynnychenko gravitated toward his homeland by means of an active involvement in its literary discourse. Although his early works were still published in Ukraine and his plays had earned success in Europe, during his stay in Czechoslovakia and Germany (1920-25) he felt more suspended between his homeland and hostland, between his ideological commitment to socialism and disillusionment in actual Bolshevik practice, and between his disdain for capitalist Europe and his search for a new home in it. In this chapter I will analyze these new changes, examining Vynnychenko's responses to his new social and cultural milieu, his shift to utopianism as a manifestation of extreme displacement, and divergent perceptions of his works in Ukraine and Europe.

3.1. Hectic Years at Home, 1914-1920

To proceed with next Vynnychenko’s displacement, I shall briefly address the period of his stay at home, 1914-20, which will shed more light on his further development. The period of 1914-20 was very hectic for Vynnychenko, which brought him from being a persecuted exile to the peak of political fame and then took him down again into permanent exile. After he returned to Ukraine in May 1914 on a fake passport under a false name, he stayed in Katerynoslav (today—Dnipropetrovs’k) until the end of the year. Hunted by the police, he and his wife had to move to Moscow, where they stayed from November 1914 to March 1917. His correspondence shows that he occasionally traveled to other places both in Ukraine (Kharkiv, Pereshory) and Russia (St. Petersburg, Mineral’nyie Vody) (Lysty do Chykalenka, 30 June 1915; *Shchodennyk* 1: 205, 20 April 1916). While in Moscow, Vynnychenko worked for the Ukrainian weekly newspaper, *Promin’* [Ray] (December 1916-early 1917).[1] In March 1917 revolutionary events in the Russian Empire and the tsar’s abdication brought him back to Kyiv, where he actively plunged into political activity. He was elected by the Ukrainian Central Rada [Council] as first Chair of the Ukrainian government—i.e., the General Secretariat—and then General Secretary of Internal Affairs (for the period from 28 June 1917 to 30 January 1918), or until the Bolshevik troops invaded Ukraine. Following the coup led by Hetman Skoropads’kyi and supported by the presence of the German army in Ukraine (Skoropads’kyi held power from April to November 1918), Vynnychenko was arrested for a short period (July 1918). In November 1918 Vynnychenko, along with Symon Petliura, headed an uprising against the Hetmanate and declared the establishment of the Directory whose rule was short-lived. Ruthless struggle was in progress during 1919-20 among the Ukrainian National Republic, the pro-tsarist monarchist forces (the Whites), and the Bolsheviks until the latter took entire control over the region (the Army of the Ukrainian National Republic retreated to Poland on 21 November 1920). Vynnychenko resigned as co-head of the Directory on 11 February 1919 in protest against its turn to the right and at the cost of the social liberation of working people. During February 1919-May 1920 he briefly resided outside the country (Semmering, Budapest, Leinz, Vienna, and Prague) focusing on his three-volume documentary work *Vidrodzhennia natsii*, in which he gave his account of revolutionary events in Ukraine. Sharing common ideological views with the Bolsheviks, he attempted to come to an understanding with them and made a trip to Ukraine and Russia. During May-September 1920 Vynnychenko stayed in Kharkiv and Moscow and negotiated his appointment to the Government of Soviet Ukraine. He was appointed Peoples' Commissar of International Affairs and Deputy Chair of the Council of Peoples' Commissars of Soviet Ukraine. But his candidacy for membership in the Political Bureau, the most influential organ in the Soviet system of power, was rejected and he therefore broke off the negotiations. He assumed that real political power would remain in Moscow and again went into European exile, to Czechoslovakia.

---

[1] The newspaper, edited by L. Solohub and Vynnychenko, dealt with literary, cultural, and community affairs. It was later closed by the Russian authorities. Here Vynnychenko published his story “Baryshen’ka” [The Sweet Young Lady] (1916, no. 1), play *Pryhvozhdeni* (11 December 1916, no. 1; (1917): 2-4: 1-10; 5-6: 1-11; 7-8: 1-14) and his article “Vichnyi vohon’” [Eternal Fire] (1-2 (14 January 1917): 20-21). Among the other contributors were Oleksander Lotots’kyi, L. Abramovych, Mykhailo Hrushevs’kyi, Serhii Iefremov, Dmytro Doroshenko, Oleksander Oles’, Oleksander Salikovs’kyi, Petro Stebnyts’kyi, Pavlo Tychyna, Mykola Filians’kyi, and Hryts’ko Chuprynka.

During 1914-20 Vynnychenko remained active in literature and the theatre. In this period he wrote the stories "Bosiak" [The Tramp] (Moscow: Dzvin, 1915), "Baryshen'ka" (*Promin'* [Moscow], 1916), "Khoma Priadka" (L'viv, 1916), "Slipyi"

[The Blind] (Kyiv: Dzvin, 1917); the plays *Mokhnonohe* (1914),[2] *Pryhvozhdeni* (Promin' [Moscow], 1916), *Panna Mara* [Miss Mara] (*Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk*, 1918, no. 2-3, pp. 118-179), *Mizh dvokh syl* [Between Two Powers] (Kyiv: Dzvin, 1919); and the novels *Khochu* (Moscow: Dzvin, 1916), and *Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelia* (*Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* (1917) 1: 21-74; 2: 180-222; 3: 24-91; 4-5: 161-211). Sixteen separate editions of his works appeared in Russian translation (Stel'mashenko, 69-70). Especially successful were his plays translated into Russian, which were staged throughout the Russian Empire.[3]

Since Vynnychenko physically returned to his homeland and was actively involved in literary and political activity there, I have not included the period of 1914-20 in this discussion and only make occasional references to it. His sojourn in Moscow might justify an analysis of the writer from the perspective of displacement. This, however, exceeds the boundary of the present project, as it would require a different methodological approach, including particularly the theory of empire. Besides, from our perspective Vynnychenko moved from Ukraine to Russia within a common imperial space with its shared social, political, and cultural institutions. The writer did not feel the same kind of displacement in Moscow as he did during his European experience of 1907-1914. Despite the large Ukrainian population of L'viv, he probably felt more displaced in that city, as it was problematic for him to cross the border and travel, say, to Kyiv; whereas from L'viv he could rather easily travel to such European cities as Geneva, Zurich, and Florence, etc. There were active Ukrainian political and cultural groups in Moscow and St. Petersburg, including such prominent figures as Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, Symon Petliura, and Dmytro Doroshenko. Vynnychenko had extensive contacts with Russian artistic and literary circles, particularly in Moscow, including the famous theatre directors Konstantin Stanislavskii, Vasilii Nemirovich-Danchenko, the actor V. Maksimov, the actress Iekaterina Roshchina-Insarova, and the writer Mikhail Artsybashev. His works were oriented toward both Ukrainian and Russian audiences. Although his involvement in the Russian discourse engendered fierce criticism from some radical Ukrainian circles, he always remained open to as broad a readership as possible. "[A]s a writer I want to be exposed to a broader audience. I'd like the whole world to read me and my works to be published in all languages, remaining a Ukrainian, as I'm now publishing my works in Russian" [[Я]к художника, мене тягне до ширшого кола читачів. Я хотів би, щоб увесь світ мене читав, на всіх мовах друкувати свої праці, лишаючись українцем, як лишаюсь ним тепер, друкуючи по-російському] (*Shchodennyk* 1: 251, 23 January 1917).

---

[2] According to Vynnychenko's diary, the play was written at the end of 1914 and ran in many theatres in the Russian Empire during 1915-1917. Many believed that Vynnychenko, dissatisfacted with the play, destroyed the text. However, it was found recently and published in the journal *Vezha* (1996, no. 4-5; 1997, no. 6-7).

[3] Vynnychenko noted in his diary which plays were staged where during 1914-17:

Brekhnia: Moscow, Petrograd (formerly St. Petersburg), Saratov—"The fon Meves Theatre"; Tiflis (today Tbilisi)—"The Baratov Theatre"; Odesa—"The A. I. Sibiriakov Odesa Drama Theatre"; Samara—"The Lebedev Theatre"; Baku—"The Polonskii Theatre."

Mokhnonohe: Moscow—"The Drama Theatre"; Saratov—"The Theatre of the Ostrovskii Association"; Kyiv—"The Solovtsov Theatre"; Kharkiv—"The Sinelnikov Theatre"; Odesa—"The Drama Theatre"; Samara—"The Lebedev Theatre"; Baku—"The Polonskii Theatre."

Pryhvozhdeni: Petrograd—"The Nezlobin Theatre"; Moscow—"The Nezlobin Theatre"; Saratov—"The Theatre of the Ostrovskii Association"; Kyiv—"The Solovtsov Theatre"; Kharkiv—"The Sinelnikov Theatre"; Odesa—"The A. I. Sibiriakov Odesa Drama Theatre"; Kyiv—"The Sinelnikov Theatre"; Kharkiv—"The Sinelnikov Theatre"; Samara—"The Lebedev Theatre"; Tiflis—"The Gitaieva Theatre," "The Tirto Association."

Chorna Pantera: Kyiv—"The Solovtsov Theatre"; Kharkiv—"The Sinelnikov Theatre"; Saratov—"The fon Meves Theatre"; Rostov na Donu—"The Baratov Theatre"; Samara—"The Lebedev Theatre"; Baku—"The Polonskii Theatre" (1: 261).

3.2. From Czechoslovakia to the Weimar Republic

In this section I shall examine Vynnychenko's encounter with a new social and cultural milieu in Czechoslovakia (he lived in Prague and Karlsbad, 1920-1921), and Germany (Berlin, Zehlendorf, and Rauen, 1921-1925).

Czechoslovakia was the largest Ukrainian émigré centre in Europe at the beginning of the 1920s. Ukrainian émigrés had financial support from the Czechoslovakian government and established a number of institutions (e.g., the Ukrainian Sociological Institute in Prague; Agricultural Academy in Przibram, etc). Here Vynnychenko collaborated with Mykyta Shapoval (he was known under the pseudonym of Mykola Sriblians'kyi), one of the leaders of the Ukrainian Party of Socialists-Revolutionaries and former member of the modernist journal *Ukrains'ka khata*. During 1919-21 Vynnychenko was one of the organizers of the so-called foreign group of the Ukrainian Communist Party[4] and contributed extensively to its organ, the newspaper *Nova doba* (Vienna). The newspaper focused mainly on current émigré political life and criticized the Bolsheviks for their chauvinistic stance regarding the national question.[5] In Prague Vynnychenko published his play *Hrikh* [The Sin] ("Nova Ukraina," 1920) and started two new plays: *Pisnia Izrailia* (*Shchodennyk* 2: 26, 8 February 1921) and *Zakon* (ibid., 2: 25, 26 January 1921), both of which he completed later in Germany.

---

[4] The Ukrainian Communist Party was founded in 1920 in Kyiv by former members of the Ukrainian Social-Democratic Workers' Party, which split in 1919. The party supported Soviet rule in Ukraine but opposed Russian domination through the Communist Party of Ukraine (Bolsheviks). It was dissolved in 1925 by a decision of the Executive Committee of the Comintern.

[5] Among his articles in *Nova doba* in this period were: "Zaklyk ZH UKP do amerykans'kykh robitnykiv-ukraintsiv" [Appeal from the Foreign Branch of the Ukrainian Communist Party to American-Ukrainian Workers] (no. 40 (4 December 1920): 3-4); "Lyst do ukrains'kykh robitnykiv i selian" [Letter to Ukrainian Workers and Peasants] (34 (23 October 1920): 2-5); "Ne u vsiomu chesni z soboiu" [Not Honest with Ourselves about Everything] (39 (28 November 1920): 1-2); "Porada berlins'kym ukrains'kym komunistam" [Advice to the Berlin Ukrainian Communists] (40 (4 December 1920): 4-6); "Revoliutsiia v nebezpetsi" [Revolution in Danger] (co-author V. Levyns'kyi) (37-39 (13, 20 and 28 November 1920): 1-2, 2-4, 2-4); "Spravozdannia z podorozhi na Ukrainu" [Report of My Visit to Ukraine] (40-42 (4, 11 and 18 December 1920): 3-6, 3-5, 3-5); and "Politychne shulerstvo" [A Political Swindle] (8 (19 February 1921): 1).

On 24 February 1921 Vynnychenko left Czechoslovakia for Germany, where he remained until 6 February 1925. In Germany he lived mostly in Zehlendorf (until July 1923) and Rauen (July 1923-November 1924)—small towns near Berlin. In Germany Vynnychenko remained involved in political activity for some time. He was the Chairman of the Famine Aid Committee for Ukraine and a member of the Ukrainian Revolutionary and Democratic Union. He continued contributing to *Nova doba* and for some time to the journal *Nova Ukraina* (Prague, 1922-1923). The latter publication was significant in that Vynnychenko, along with his journalistic articles, managed to publish there his new literary works, such as the plays *Hrikh* (2nd edition) and *Zakon* and the novel *Na toi bik*.

To understand better Vynnychenko's move to Germany and the implications it had for his life and works, we cannot avoid discussing the phenomenon of the Weimar Republic (1918-1933). The German republic was proclaimed on 9 November 1918. The Constitution was adopted on 11 August 1919 in Weimar (hence, the name of the republic), considered one of the most democratic constitutions of its day. The situation in the country, however, was strained in the wake of World War I. Various political forces—monarchist, socialist, communist, and nationalist—sought power. The burden of the post-war reparations that were imposed by the victors on the German government (as a result of the Treaty of Versailles, 28 June 1919) stimulated extremist tendencies. Inspired by the Bolshevik revolution, German communists headed by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg sought active support from the impoverished working class. The

Marxist view of the inevitability of the collapse of capitalism and the emergence of a socialist state seemed to have captured the hearts and minds of many people, including intellectuals, who opposed the old monarchic and bourgeois order. However, both the Bavarian Soviet Republic (8 November 1918-May 1919) and the communist revolt on 6 January 1919 failed, as Germans opted for the social democracy of the Weimar Republic.

Such intense processes in the political and social spheres had a significant impact on the cultural life of the country. The early 1920s, often called the period of the Weimar Renaissance, combined the modernist tendencies of the *fin de siècle* with a search for new meanings and values after the devastating war. "A war has been destroyed; we must seek a radical solution," proclaimed Walter Gropius, the founder and director of the Bauhaus school of design in Weimar, the leading German institution introducing new aesthetic and cultural norms. They believed that they were creating a new world through art. Expressionism became a powerful movement which had been flowering in Germany through the 1910-20s. It was specifically understood as the "discovery of all modern art", an all-embracing term which was used to define a variety of heterogeneous avant-garde movements (i.e., Cubism, Futurism, Die Brücke, the Fauves and Der Blaue Reiter), and opposed to naturalism and impressionism (Richard, 12).[6] Expressionism touched different fields: painting (George Grosz, Max Beckmann, Otto Dix), music (Arnold Schoenberg, Anton von Webern, Alban Berg), film (*Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari* [The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari] (1920), *Nosferatu—eine Symphonie des Grauens* [Nosferatu—A

---

[6] The term "expressionism" was initially applied to a group of French Cubist painters (Picasso, Dufy, and Braque) who presented their works at the 22nd exhibition of the Berliner Sezession. Later the term was extended to define any artist who was opposed to impressionism and naturalism. Kurt Hiller was the first to apply the term to literature in the supplement to *Heidelberger Zeitung* (1911): "…[A]t least, those aesthetes who know only how to react, who are nothing more than wax-tablets for impressions, or delicately exact recording machines really do seem to us to be inferior beings. We are Expressionists" (qt. in Sheppard, 274).

Symphony of Horror] (1922)), architecture (Peter Behrens, Bruno Taut, Erich Mendelsohn), and literature (Georg Kaiser, Ernst Toller, Bertolt Brecht). Two major journals, *Die Aktion* (1911-32) and *Der Sturm* (1910-32), were devoted to the movement. Among its most salient features were subjective emotionality (rather extraneous to other avant-garde movements), exaggeration and distortion of reality, symbolic representation, satire on bourgeois values, apocalyptic vision, ideological inclination and concern for social and political reform. In objectifying inner experience through external objects, Expressionism pays much attention to formal devices. Characters become masks representing a certain position. Often Expressionism is associated with a leftist orientation and propaganda purposes. A sense of a profound crisis of the capitalist system being on the verge of cataclysm was intrinsic to expressionists who could seek an alternative prophetizing a better future. Rainer Rumold calls Expressionism future-oriented: "Expressionism as a movement claimed to be future-oriented in the struggle for a better, more humane, "spiritual" modernity elevating art over modern social discourses" (4). Meanwhile, Wolf-Dieter Dube connects the expressionist idea of the new man with utopian dreams: "The Expressionist utopia of the new man, informed by the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity, and able to expedite the coming of a new era of the spirit, aimed to supersede a society based on materialism and selfishness (http://www.palazzograssi.it/eng/mostre/espressionismo/intro/sogno.htm). We shall see below how these characteristics of Expressionism will surface in Vynnychenko's novel *Soniachna mashyna*.

That atmosphere of a cultural breakthrough in Germany closely paralleled Ukraine in the 1920s, a period of national and cultural revival. Among current European artistic trends, German Modernism had probably the greatest influence on Ukrainian art of the period. There were, in particular, references and translations of works of such expressionist writers as Kaiser, Toller, Rudolf Leonard, and Karl Sternheim. Kaiser's play *Gas* was staged by Les' Kurbas by the Berezil' theatre in 1923. *Der Sturm* was advertised in Ukraine, particularly by the futurist journal *Nova generatsiia* [New Generation] (1928, nos. 7 and 10), and its editor, Herwarth Walden, visited Kyiv in September 1929, where he met with Ukrainian futurists.[7]

With the new democratic constitution and the ease with which entry visas could be obtained, Germany became a country that welcomed immigrants. Cheap post-war living was also an attractive factor. A highly developed book publishing business and flourishing cultural life served as a magnet to attract artists and intellectuals from other countries. Among them was Alexander Archipenko, who came to Berlin from France and stayed during 1921-23 (Leshko, 93). According to the German census, in 1925 there were 250,000 individuals in Germany who had previously lived on the territory of the Russian Empire in 1914 (Williams, 111). However, in 1923 an economic and political crisis hit the country, and the German mark was devalued to 2.7 million marks for $1 US by 16 August 1923 (Glad, 3). Although the economy stabilized the following year, the crisis forced a general exodus to France, Czechoslovakia, the USSR, the Balkans, the USA, and elsewhere.

In contrast to his first displacement (1907-14), Vynnychenko made serious efforts to adjust to the hostland. Having abandoned his political career, he plunged more deeply into the world of literature, art, and philosophy by attending exhibitions, theatres, cinemas, reading new texts, and attempting to approach the European audience with his works. While in Germany, the writer continued to be interested in modern philosophy. In his diary he made particular references to the French philosopher Jean-Marie Guyau, who dealt with issues of aesthetics, ethics, and religion (*Shchodennyk* 2: 42, 30 June 1921); the German philosophers Arthur Schopenhauer (*Counsels and Maxims*) (ibid., 2: 316-17, 25 March 1924), Wilhelm Max Wundt (*Ethik. Eine Untesuchung der Tatsachen und Gesetzen des sittlichen Lebens*) (ibid., 2: 71, 1921)[8] and psychoanalyst Wilhelm Stekel (ibid., 2: 298, 27 February 1924). Concerning the formal aspects of writing, Vynnychenko, paradoxically, seemed to be more influenced by the visual arts rather than literary works, namely paintings by impressionists (i.e., Monet, Kokoschka), German expressionists of the "Sturm," and cinema. Vynnychenko's diary gives us numerous examples of his interest in modern and expressionist painting. On 28 April 1922 he attended an exhibition of the "Sturm," which also published a journal called *Der Sturm* (ibid., 2: 123). The writer was impressed by an exhibit that he attended on 5 November 1924:

---

[7] See Ilnytzkyj 1997, 117n, 118n, 144 and 339.

> В палаці модерного малярства. Знайдення джерел впливу на Глущенка: молодий німець Dix з його двома автопортретами. Та ж сама неподібність, та сама манера письма, той же фон пейзажу з квіточками. Уся виставка все те саме: досконалість форми й музики фарб і блідість сюжетного змісту. Цікаво, як позначився вплив часу і певних течій на деяких малярах. Liebermann в 1880 році і він же в 1912-13 роках,—це зовсім різні автори. Дивно, чомусь тут же Monet і Kokoschka з своїми ультрасиніми полотнами з явним бажанням перекричати сусідів (ibid., 2: 437).

> [I am in] the palace of modern art. I have found the sources of influence on Hlushchenko: the young German Dix with his two self-portraits. The same dissimilarity, the same manner of painting, and the same background of a landscape with little flowers. The entire exhibition is the same: perfection of form and music of

---

[8] No specific date is indicated.

> colours, and weakness of subject. It's interesting how time and some artistic trends have influenced certain painters. Liebermann in 1880 and in 1912-13 is entirely different. It's strange to see here Monet and Kokoschka, whose ultra-blue paintings definitely want to overshadow his neighbours.

In his diary Vynnychenko notes his wife Rosalia's impressions of an exhibit by the "Secession" group, a modernistic current in German art, headed by Liebermann (ibid., 2: 487, January 1925). His lasting interest in painting was also revived because of his acquaintance with a group of Ukrainian artists in Germany. Among them was Mykola Hlushchenko, who remained a close friend of Vynnychenko and his wife after their move to France and until his return to Ukraine in 1937.[9] The writer was positively struck by the innovative character of another young Ukrainian painter, Ivan Babii: "[I've been] to the Hlushchenko and Babii exhibit. The talent of both painters is obvious. From young apprentices they developed into genuine young seekers of new ways" [На виставці Глущенка і Бабія. Талант обох виразно помітний. З хлопців-учнів зробилися справжніми молодими шукачами нових шляхів] (ibid., 2: 356, 4 April 1924). Vynnychenko also found the works of an amateur painter named Hanna Sobachko from Ukraine to be "quite modernistic and rich" (ibid., 2: 438, 7 November 1924). He met the prominent Ukrainian sculptor, Alexander Archipenko, who often had exhibits in Berlin during the 1920s (ibid., 2: 118, 30 March 1922). Curiously, I found no references in Vynnychenko to such innovative expressionist writers as Georg Kaiser or Ernst Toller. All in all, the general cultural atmosphere of the Weimar Republic in the 1920s was quite favourable for creative activity, including Vynnychenko's.

---

[9] Some scholars assume that Hlushchenko was recruited as a KGB agent (Fedoruk).

During this period Vynnychenko continued to explore his interest in the theatre. Among the plays that he attended were *Reigen* by the Austrian playwright Arthur Schnitzer (ibid., 2: 32, 30 March 1921), *Ved Rigets Port* by the Norwegian Knut Hamsun (ibid., 2: 35, 3 May 1921), *Na dnie* [At the Bottom] by the Russian Maxim Gorky (ibid., 4 May 1921), *Dybbuk* by the Jewish playwright Solomon Ansky (ibid., 2: 60, 23 November 1921) and a play[10] by the Irish writer Bernard Shaw (ibid., 2: 455, 8 December 1924). He was critical of the latter comedy, but in general he liked Shaw's dramaturgy.[11]

Although Vynnychenko was interested in film earlier, now this interest intensified because of the experimental nature of German film. Such films as *Das Cabinet des Dr. Caligari* and *Nosferatu—eine Symphonie des Grauens* were part of the expressionist movement's search for new aesthetic values to reflect post-war realities (Kaes). In Czechoslovakia Vynnychenko saw *Anne Boleyn* (*Shchodennyk* 2: 26, 12 February 1921) and *Rund um die Ehe* in Germany (ibid., 2: 458, 14 December 1924) by the famous German director Ernst Lubitsch. In Germany he also saw *Danton* by the Russian Dmitrii Bukhovetskii (ibid., 2: 28, 27 February 1921), *Quo Vadis* based on a novel by the Polish writer Henryk Sienkiewicz (ibid., 2: 495, 18 January 1925), and films with Charlie Chaplin (ibid., 2: 251, 18 November 1923). Vynnychenko was quite critical of Chaplin's films, but held Lubitsch's innovative cinematic art in high esteem. Concerning *Rund um die Ehe* he noted: "Artistically made. I must note it. I'd like to work with Lubitsch someday" [Художньо. Треба занотувати. З Lubitsch'ем можна колись мати справу] (ibid., 2: 458, 14 December 1924). Vynnychenko's admiration for the new art and media inspired him to launch his own projects. Interestingly, he started his *Pisnia Izrailia* as a film script (ibid., 2: 25, 1 February 1921), which was later transformed into a play (ibid., 2: 50, 13 September 1921). His other film scripts were based on his literary works. *Soniachna mashyna* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, although he worked on the former project and his novel almost simultaneously (ibid., 2: 52, September 1921). On 28 April 1921 he visited the largest German film producer, UFA (Universum-Film AG, founded in 1917), seeking collaboration (ibid., 2: 35). *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* under the title *Die schwarze Pantherin* was made into a German film in 1921 jointly by two companies, Decla-Bioscop AG and Russo-Film GmbH (Berlin) (director: Johannes Guter) (Kostiuk 1980a, 87; Stel'mashenko, 11).[12] The première of the film was held on 14 October 1921 in Berlin, during which Vynnychenko was present (*Shchodennyk* 2: 54). An abridged version of the film scenario was published in *Illustrieter Film-Kurier* (January 1921, no. 73) with a number of illustrations (*Shchodennyk* 2: 84, comments by Motyl). Vynnychenko, together with the former Georgian consul in Germany Vasso Dumbadze, tried to establish a film company "Ukrainfilm." UFA agreed to collaborate with "Ukrainfilm" (ibid., 2: 108, 29 January 1922), but nothing came of the project because of lack of financing after Dumbadze left for the USA.

---

[10] In his diary Vynnychenko calls Shaw's play *Lover*, which is apparently an inaccurate translation of the original title, as there is no such Shaw's play.

[11] It may be assumed from the diary that all these plays were staged in Berlin.

During this period Vynnychenko more actively sought contacts with artistic circles in Germany and other countries. Besides his collaboration with the film-maker J. Guter, the writer had business dealings with the publisher Gustav Kiepenheuer (owner of the Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag publishing house founded in 1910) and the poet and translator Gustav Specht. There was an extensive correspondence between Vynnychenko and Kiepenheuer regarding Vynnychenko's works and staging of his plays, such as

---

[12] Information on the film is also on the German Web site http://www.kinotv.com/proc/film/film.cfm?filmcode=3653 [2 June 2005], with reference to Vynnychenko as the author of the script. The Russian actress Elena Polevitskaia [Polewitzkaja] starred in the main role.

Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid' and *Brekhnia*.[13] For example, in a letter dated 23 September 1921 the Ukrainian writer informs the publisher about the abridgement of *Brekhnia* and an agreement with Specht, who translated the play (*Shchodennyk* 2: 51). In 1922 Kiepenheuer released the two above-mentioned plays.[14] Later he agreed to publish an abridged version of *Soniachna mashyna*. But Vynnychenko refused, as it required cutting two-thirds of the text (ibid., 2: 608, 19 August 1925). Specht was highly regarded as an accomplished translator of Vynnychenko's works, *Brekhnia* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'.* He was also known as a member of the editorial board of the monthly *Die Ukraine*, the organ of the German-Ukrainian Association, and the author of articles on Ukrainian topics.[15]

Vynnychenko also had contacts among migrants from the former Russian Empire—Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, and Georgians. Among Russian émigrés he had contacts with writers, such as Remizov, Belyi, Erenburg, Lundberg, and Shraider, who were grouped around the publishing house "Skify." The Russian Drama Theatre in Berlin successfully staged his play *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*. He was personally acquainted with the director of the theatre Ivan Shmidt (Shmit), his actress-wife Ielena Polevitskaia, as well as other actors (Gzovskaia, Gaidarov, and Neludov) (Motyl and Kostiuk, 20). *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* was published first in Russian translation by the Russian émigré publisher "Vozrozhdeniie" [Revival] in Berlin (1922). The original Ukrainian version appeared a year later. Another Russian émigré publisher in

---

[13] Beginning in 11 July 1921 until 19 August 1925, there were 35 references to Kiepenheuer in Vynnychenko's diary.

[14] Wynnytschenko, Wolodymyr. *Die Lüge*. Drama in drei Akten. Einzig autorisierte Übersetzung aus dem Ukrainischen von Gustav Specht. Potsdam: Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag, 1922; *Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze*. Schauspiel in 4 Akten von Wolodymyr Wynnytschenko. Einzig autorisierte Übersetzung aus dem Ukrainischen von Gustav Specht. Potsdam: Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag, 1922.

[15] For the period 1921-25 there were 21 references to Specht in Vynnychenko's diary.

Berlin, Olga Diakova, issued reprints of his two novels *Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelia* (1922) and *Chesnist' z soboiu* (1922). The story "Talisman" [Talisman] was issued by Ie. Gutnov's publishing house (1922) (Stel'mashenko, 70-71).

During his stay in Germany, Vynnychenko had great success in promoting his plays. In fact, he became the first Ukrainian playwright to be extensively translated and staged in many European countries. His plays appeared in Germany (Leipzig, Berlin, Dresden, Munich, and Nuremberg), Italy (Rome, Turin, Milan, and Ravenna), Czechoslovakia (Prague), Spain (Madrid), The Netherlands (Amsterdam), Switzerland (Zurich), Austria (Vienna), Poland, Yugoslavia, Norway, and Denmark (Copenhagen). Especially popular were *Brekhnia* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, which were written during Vynnychenko's first displacement. *Brekhnia*, for example, ran successfully sixty times in the Berlin State Theatre "Volksbühne Theater," headed by actor-director Friedrich Kayssler. In his favourable review of the play in the theatre periodical *Die Rampe* he wrote:

> The special charm of the play consists in the manner in which, during a quiet mundane struggle which a group of simple people wages in a half-unconscious and half-conscious manner, one single will [that of Natalia, the heroine of the play] transcends itself; a will which has determined to give of itself and which perishes for the good of others because of this determination (qt. in Rudnytzky, 363).

The German critic Fritz Mack, writing in the *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten* (June 4 1921), noted Vynnychenko's knowledge of the European tradition and compared him to Sardou, Henri Bernstein, Sudermann, Ibsen, and Strindberg.[16] *Brekhnia* was even more popular in Italy, where it ran over 300 times. A famous Italian actress, Emma Gramatica, included it in her repertoire, which she performed for three years. Favourable reviews were published in such newspapers as *Il Momento* (Rome, 24 October 1924), *La Stampa* (Turin, 25 October 1924), *La Gazzetta del Popolo* (Milan, 24 October 1924) and *Corriere Padano* (Ravenna, 17 February 1926) (di Marco, 378; 382). In his diary Vynnychenko comments briefly on the success of his plays:

---

[16] Another favourable review of the play was published by Hans Ratonek in the *Leipziger Zeitung*, 4-5 June, 1921. For more details about the reception of Vynnychenko's plays in Germany, see Leonid Rudnytzky.

> Обід з директором і огляд Ляйпцігу. Вистава "Die Lüge". Успіх. Вечеря з артистами (*Shchodennyk* 2: 39, 3 June 1921).
>
> Lunch with the director and sightseeing in Leipzig. Performance of *Die Lüge* [The Lie]. Success. Supper with the artists.
>
> Лист від Шаповала. Успіх „Чорної Пантери" в Празі (ibid., 2: 57, 3 November 1921).
>
> A letter from Shapoval. The success of *Chorna Pantera* in Prague.
>
> Прихильна рецензія на виставу "Lüge" в Münchner Kammerspiele (ibid., 2: 128, 6 June 1922).
>
> A positive review of the play *Die Lüge* in *Münchner Kammerspiele*.
>
> Екземпляр "Sünde". Рецензія Запольської на „Гріх": завоював усі европейські сцени (ibid., 2: 379, 21 July 1924).
>
> An issue of *Sünde*. A review by Zapol's'ka on *Hrikh*: it has conquered all the European stages.
>
> У Міляні вистава "Брехні". В "Corriere della Sera" "восторженна" стаття (повідомлення Шрайдера) (ibid., 2: 460, 16 December 1924).
>
> *Brekhnia* in Milan. An impressive article in *Corriere della Sera* (according to Shraider).

Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'[17] had less success than *Brekhnia* (I shall address the response in greater detail below). His first novel *Chesnist' z soboiu* was also published in Czech translation (1922).[18]

This penetration of Europe's cultural scene was possible as a result of Vynnychenko's contacts with European and diasporic circles. After the exodus of the Ukrainian army in 1920 there were Ukrainian groups scattered throughout Europe (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Germany, France, Yugoslavia) (Narizhnyi), as well as representatives of former Ukrainian diplomatic missions. Vynnychenko had "literary agents" in Prague (Shapoval) and in Germany (Volodymyr Levyts'kyi, a former director of press service at the Ukrainian embassy in Berlin, 1919-20). Through Kiepenheuer Vynnychenko had contacts with German and other theatres. For instance, Kiepenheuer informed Vynnychenko by letter that his play *Brekhnia* was accepted for staging in Munich and Amsterdam (*Shchodennyk* 2: 124, 1 May 1922). Vynnychenko's affiliation with the socialist movement was another channel for distributing his work. Among European socialists who assisted him was the Czech Vincenc Charvát, who translated the story "Student."[19] Later, in 1926, Vynnychenko requested the Ukrainian Public Committee in Prague to write on his behalf a letter to the French writer Romain Rolland, who was sympathetic to socialism, inviting him to write a preface to *Soniachna mashyna*.

---

[17] The following reviews were published: J. Kn., "*Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze.* Uraufführung in der Tribüne." *Boersen Zeitung* (Berlin), 14 July 1922; E. M., "*Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze.*" *Berliner Morgenpost.* 16 July 1922; A. M., "Wynnytschenkos *Pantherkatze.*" *Vossische Zeitung* (Berlin). 14 July 1922; K. H. B., "Psychologeles in der Tribüne. *Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze.*" *Das deutsche Abendblatt.* 14 July 1922; Gysae, Otto. "Ukrainisches Theater. Wynnytschenko: *Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze.*" *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* (Berlin). 14 July 1922; A. P., Wynnytschenko: *Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze.*" *Tägliche Rundschau* (Berlin). 14 July 1922 (Rudnytzky, 369-370). There was also an article by Wasyl Simowytsch, "Über das ukrainische Theater," in *Mitteilungen der Leipziger Schauspielgemeinde* (3 June 1921), which elaborated on Vynnychenko's dramaturgy (Rudnytzky, 366-67).

[18] The novel was published under the title: *Anarchisté (Poctovost k sobě)*. Roman. Přeložil Jaroslav Řehák. Praha: Kominističké knihkupectí a nakladetelství R. Rejman, 1922.

[19] "Student." Praha: Vilímek [n. d.]

3.3. Ambiguities of the New Displacement

In this section I shall focus on how the new displacement affected Vynnychenko's political, ideological, and literary stance, as well as his relationship with the homeland and diaspora.

Paradoxically, Vynnychenko's adjustment and recognition in Europe caused even more ambiguity and dividedness. How long would his displacement last? For what audience should he be writing? How to respond to the political and cultural process in the homeland and hostland—these were just some of the questions that tormented the writer. Among his biggest concerns were tensions between national and social issues; the diaspora and the Bolsheviks; politics and literature, not to mention his search for a new meaning in life. Vynnychenko was quite conflicted on whether to support the national Ukrainian "bourgeois" state (what he called "petliurivshchyna")[20] or the socialist state controlled by the Bolshevik government in Moscow. Here is how he painfully responded to this dilemma:

> І знов для мене та сама трагедія, що на протязі майже двох років стільки разів роздирала мене. Іти з руськими большевиками,—душити своїми руками свою націю, самого себе. Іти з петлюрівщиною, реакцією,—душити революцію, душити самого себе, душити те, що я вважаю добрим для всієї людськости (*Shchodennyk* 1: 433-34, 3 June 1920).[21]

> And once again I have the same tragedy that has been tearing me apart for almost two years. To join the Russian Bolsheviks means to oppress my nation and myself with my own hands. To join Petliura and the reactionary forces means to oppress the revolution, myself, and everything that I consider to be good for the whole of mankind.

---

[20] In fact, their leaders were socialists who sought support from the Western states.
[21] See also *Shchodennyk* 1: 404, 24 October 1920; 1: 405, 2 November 1920.

This tension eventually led to very strained relationships between Vynnychenko and the highly politicized Ukrainian diaspora and ruptured relations with his former fellow revolutionaries (i.e., Petliura, Panas Fedenko, and Isaac Mazepa). Having collaborated with Petliura in the pre-revolutionary Ukrainian press (e.g., *Ukrainskaia zhizn'*, 1912-17), during the first Ukrainian government (1917-18) and the Directory of the Ukrainian National Republic (1918-19), the two men now found themselves in different political and ideological camps. Petliura's government in exile sought Western support to restore Ukrainian statehood, whereas Vynnychenko recognized only socialism and a socialist Ukraine. This conflict between the two leaders of the Ukrainian revolution was addressed in Vynnychenko's article in *Nova doba*, in which he called Petliura a traitor of the socialist cause and "maniac-accountant" [maniiak bukhhalter] (4: 5, 27 March 1920).

With time, the writer began avoiding close contacts with émigré circles. For example, Vynnychenko refused to take part in the celebration of Ukraine's independence (declared on 18 January 1918), which was organized by a Ukrainian organization in Berlin (*Shchodennyk* 2: 182, 26 January 1923). Although his closest colleague, Shapoval, repeatedly invited him to move to Prague, he felt more and more alienated, preferring artistic autonomy in Germany to group activity in Czechoslovakia. Eventually his isolationist tendencies led to a severe break with the diaspora. He writes in his diary: "A final rupture of my relations with Prague's quagmire[22]... I'm searching for a support point in this new situation of political isolation and temporary loneliness. I long for loneliness in everyday life—as a means to strengthen and deepen my views" [Остаточна ліквідація відносин з празьким болотом... Шукання точки опору в новій ситуації—політичної ізольованости й тимчасової самоти. Туга за самотністю в буденщині.—як засобу зміцнення і заглиблення своїх висновків] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 583, 30 June 1925). Later, Vynnychenko wanted to sever contacts with the diaspora totally:

---

[22] This is what Vynnychenko called the group of Ukrainian émigrés in Prague.

> Дійсно, хочеться бути цілком-цілком ізольованим од усього українського. Думаємо, думаємо, куди б заїхати так, щоб ніхто й сліду не знайшов. Де б у Африці чи Азії знайти лікарську посаду для Кохи, щоб не померти з голоду. І, обтрусити з ніг своїх весь цей бруд, сміття, гидь. І в цілковитій самоті, немов зовсім померлий для цих "носіїв великої ідеї", працювати для Великого Цілого. Хоч на п'ять років зникнути! Та куди? Нема ніде місця, бо скрізь треба їсти (*Shchodennyk*, 7 August 1926).[23]

> Indeed, I want to be entirely isolated from everything Ukrainian. We go on thinking where to arrive so that no one will find even a trace. Where in Africa or Asia would we find a medical position for Kokha just so as not to die from hunger. And to shake off all this dirt, rubbish, and rot. And to work for the Big Whole in total seclusion, as though dead to these "carriers of a great idea." To escape at least for five years! But where? There is no place, because everywhere one must eat.

Vynnychenko's attitude toward the Bolsheviks is significant, as it largely defined his relationship with the homeland and influenced his ideological views. His attitude was two-fold: he denounced the Bolsheviks' rule as oppressive and imperialistic, but on the other hand, he shared with them views on socialism and communism. In *Nova doba* and *Nova Ukraina* Vynnychenko published a number of articles that were critical of the Bolsheviks. Particularly noteworthy was his article (in collaboration with V. Levyns'kyi) entitled "Revoliutsiia v nebezpetsi" [Revolution in Danger] (1920), which also appeared in German, French, and Italian (Motyl and Kostiuk, 11). As a result, the writer was declared *persona non grata* at the All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets held in Kharkiv during 25 February-3 March 1921. In March 1921 the Ukrainian Communist Party renounced its relationship with its foreign branch in Europe. In October 1921 the foreign branch of the Ukrainian Communist Party and its organ, *Nova doba*, were dissolved.

---

[23] Vynnychenko even revealed his fears for his life, particularly after the May 1926 assassination of the émigré political leader Symon Petliura (*Shchodennyk*, 5 August 1926), whom he had criticized. The danger from Ukrainian rivals or from Soviet agents bothered him, so much so that he drew up a will bequeathing his property not only to his relatives but also "for the spread of ideas of human happiness and for the struggle and work for this happiness" (ibid., 23 March 1927). Vynnychenko thought about writing a comedy on the Ukrainian emigration under the title *Tsekhmaistry nad solomoiu*, or *Tsekhmaistry*, [Shop Masters] but vacillated, because it might have had a bad effect on the overall Ukrainian movement (20 October 1926).

Vynnychenko's disregard for 'smena vekh,'[24]—a political current that emerged in the early 1920s among Russian, Ukrainian, and other émigrés which was aimed at overcoming displacement through reconciliation with the Bolsheviks—was also an important indicator of his irreconcilable attitude toward the Bolshevik regime. Even suspicion of a person's sympathies for the Soviets impelled him to sever his relations with all collaborators. That was the case, for example, with the socialist Ievgenii Lundberg: "A rupture with Ie. Lundberg for his collaboration in the 'smena vekh' newspaper *Nakanune*...[25] I can't have friendly relations with a man of such ideas" [Розрив з Є. Лундбергом за його участь у смєновєховському "Накануне"... не можу бути в приятельських відносинах з людиною таких ідей] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 127-28, 1 May 1922). He was also critical of Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, the first president of the Ukrainian Central Rada, who was the most prominent Ukrainian émigré to return home in 1924 (ibid., 2: 250, 12 November 1923). However, with time Vynnychenko admits that 'smena vekh' movement was very natural for the 'masses.' He particularly notes in his diary:

> Картка від Шаповала. Пише про розвиток "смєновєхівства" серед української еміграції. Чується сум в його словах. Але, на мою думку, нормальне і

---

[24] The Russian term 'smena vekh' means literally the change of postsignes.

[25] The Russian newspaper *Nakanune* was published in Berlin (26 March 1922-June 1924) and had a pro-Soviet orientation. The editors were G. Kirdetsov, S. Lukianov, B. Diushen, and Iu. Potiekhin. It had a weekly literary supplement that featured works by both Soviet and émigré writers (Struve, 35).

> навіть здорове явище в масі, в стихії, а не в його ідеологах... Маса ж шукає виходу й рятунку від фізичної й духовної загибелі. Ясно, що треба їхати до себе, додому, незважаючи на те, що ту "дому" захоплено ворожими силами (2: 258, 21 December 1923).

> A postcard from Shapoval. He writes about the development of the 'smena vekh' movement among Ukrainian émigrés. I feel sadness in his words. But, in my opinion, this is a normal and healthy spontaneous phenomenon among the mass, not its ideologists... The mass looks for a way out and rescue from physical and spiritual death. It's clear that they should go home, even though that "home" has been captured by enemy forces.

Although Vynnychenko had no great trust in the Bolsheviks, his anger was seemingly mollified after the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) proclaimed the policy of *korenizatsiia* (indigenization; also referred to as *Ukrainization* in Ukraine) at its twelfth congress in 1923. The new policy allowed more political and cultural freedom in the Soviet republics, inspiring the short-lived period often known as the period of national revival—1923-33.[26] In literature, this led to an unprecedented flowering of various movements (e.g., Futurism, avant-garde, psychological realism, romanticism) that culminated in the so-called "literary discussion."[27] Especially indicative of Vynnychenko's attitude toward his homeland was his brochure *Povorot na Ukrainu* [The Return to Ukraine] (1926), specially written in order to convince émigrés to return home and continue contributing to the nation- and state-building process.

---

[26] One should, however, notice that this period can be divided on two parts: 1923-27 as a high time of liberalization and 1928-33 as gradual slipping down to totalitarianism, marked with the famine of 1932-33, first executions of writers and the first Congress of the Union of Soviet Writers in 1934.

[27] The "Literary discussion" in the 1920s was a focus in a number of works such as Luckyj, George. *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990; Shkandrij, Myroslav. *Modernists, Marxists and the Nation: the Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1992.

Criticizing the Bolsheviks for their distortion of true Marxism, Vynnychenko nevertheless remained an adherent of the Marxist theory concerning the inevitability of socialism as a new and more progressive social order. It would replace capitalism, which was in decline and doomed to disappear. The writer was confident that the fall of capitalism was only a question of time: “Capitalism will shed much more blood, it will strangle many lives in its death-agony embrace before it falls in this momentous struggle that will be fatal to it” [Ще багато крови проллє Капітал, ще багато життя задушить у своїх передсмертних обіймах, поки упаде в цій гігантській і фатальній для його боротьбі] (*Vidrodzhennia natsii* 3: 503). In his article, “Utopiia i diisnist’” [Utopia and Reality] (13 March 1920), Vynnychenko critisizes socialist parties for their “evolutionary” approach to the capitalist system and actually links them with counter-revolutionaries. Convinced of the need for a radical change of power, he expresses his belief in a “Great World Revolution”:

> І даремно ріжні “соціялістичні” ідеологи цієї збірної недобитої контрреволюції сподіваються, що трон капіталу впаде не раптово, а тихенько, лагідненько, в “культурних” формах... Ні, й цей трон упаде так само, як падають усі трони, упаде з великим грохотом, упаде під неделікатними ударами “фантаста”-пролетаріата й впаде в таких формах, в яких вимагатиме боротьба клас не на життя, а на смерть. Бо єдина жива, реальна дійсність теперішнього часу є Велика Всесвітня Революція. Все ж, що пробує одвернути цю неминучість, є, во-істину, злочинна й дурна утопія, безнадійна фантастика (1).[28]
>
> Various “socialist” ideologists of this collective remnant of the counter-revolution vainly expect that the throne of the capital will collapse, not suddenly but quietly, gently, in “cultural” forms… No, this throne too will fall in the same way as all

---

[28] Interestingly, his wife Rosalia published an article entitled “Kapitalism i khvoroby” [Capitalism and Diseases], in which she made the connection between human diseases and capitalism: “[Diseases exist because] all European countries are capitalist and the proletariat is an object of exploitation” [[Хвороби є тому,] що всі європейські країни є капіталістичні, що пролетаріят там служить об’єктом експлуатації] (ibid., 4).

> thrones collapse—with a huge rumble, it will fall from a forceful attack of the "fantasist"-proletariat; and it will fall down in such forms that will be required by the struggle of the classes, not for life but death. Because the only living, true reality of the present time is the Great World Revolution. Everything that tries to deflect this inevitability is truly a criminal and silly utopia, a hopeless fantasy.

Later, in 1925, he noted in his diary: "The decay of the capitalist world stinks with a putrid smell" [Розклад капіталістичного світу б'є в ніс трупною задухою] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 532, 21 March). At the same time he accepted the existence of the USSR as the first socialist state, which he considered inspiring: "I'm reading Soviet newspapers… Objectively they have a wonderful goal. To have as a goal the transformation of all people on the planet is a goal worthy of existence" [Читаю совєтські газети... Об'єктивно мають прекрасну ціль. Мати ціль життя—переворот люду на всій плянеті—ціль гідна існування] (ibid., 2: 580, 24 June 1925).

This sense of historical determinism explains to a great extent his state of temporariness in the current political situation and his high degree of expectation for the future. "I sense some kind of emptiness in experiencing the world. Everything is unreal and temporary" [Якась порожнеча у відчуванні світу. Все—несправжнє, тимчасове], he jotted in his diary (ibid., 2: 600, 4 August 1925). To some extent Vynnychenko reflected the general atmosphere of transition that characterized German society. He belonged to those left-wing radicals who had removed themselves from the real world of social democracy, with its crises and right-leaning tendencies, and entered on abstract world that was yet to come. He did not accept the evolutionary transformations within Western capitalist societies and looked forward to cardinal changes. His utopian novel *Soniachna mashyna*, which I will address below, was the apotheosis of this ideological stance. Vynnychenko's contradictions grew as he supported the ideology of 'the first

Socialist state,' the USSR; at the same time he assumed that the real practice of building socialism diverged sharply from the ideals of such a society. This discrepancy between high expectations of a world revolution and sober reality of Bolshevik practice, between his loathing of "bourgeois Europe," which had given him asylum, and support for the USSR, which expelled him, largely determined his psychological rift.

Vynnychenko's relationship with the homeland was also ambiguous. Going abroad in 1920, he expected not to return home until the Bolshevik regime collapsed. Despite the political sanctions imposed on him by the Bolsheviks, he, nevertheless, remained quite popular as a writer and thus functioned in the literary discourse of his homeland. Twenty-four separate editions of his works were released in 1921-1925, including eight volumes of a multi-volume edition (Stel'mashenko, 30-31; 46). During 1920-26 his plays ran in the T. Shevchenko State Ukrainian Drama theatre (e.g., *Hrikh, Dyzharmoniia, Natus', Panna Mara, Mizh dvokh syl, Brekhnia,* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*) and in the "Molodyi teatr" (*Hrikh, Brekhnia,* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*) and were quite popular with audiences (Ryl's'kyi, 108, 120; Stel'mashenko, 192). Vynnychenko was also asked to send new plays for staging. This is evident, for example, from a letter written by Dmytro Rovyns'kyi of the T. Shevchenko State Ukrainian Drama theatre in Kyiv, dated 30 July 1921 ("Lysty do," 317-18). He also maintained contacts with young writers of the realist school (Hryhorii Kosynka, Valerian Pidmohyl'nyi, Todos' Os'machka, etc), whom he helped financially and assisted with their publications in émigré periodicals, particularly in *Nova Ukraina*. Competition from émigré journals prompted Soviet officials to establish a new journal called *Chervonyi shliakh* [Red Pathway] (Kharkiv, 1923) to counteract the publications appearing in *Nova*

Ukraina (Motyl and Kostiuk, 14). Vynnychenko responded to the launch of *Chervonyi shliakh* with his article “Znamenna podiia” [A Remarkable Event] (published in *Nova Ukraina* 6 (1923): 8-27).

Many critics have acknowledged Vynnychenko’s influence on several young Soviet Ukrainian writers, including Kosynka, Khvylovyi, Antonenko-Davydovych, Pidmohyl’nyi, Slisarenko, and Ivchenko (Pohorilyi, 24; Hrechaniuk, 234-235). For example, upon receiving Kosynka’s book *Na zolotykh bohiv* [Against the Golden Gods] Vynnychenko notes in his diary:

> Одержав листа з України від Гр. Косинки. Він—“неблагонадійний”. Заявляє свою приналежність до мого літературного напряму, називаючи себе моїм учеником. Посилає книжечку оповідань “На золотих богів”. Дійсно, в ній дуже помітний мій вплив, аж до манери деяких ліричних висловлень, звернень до читача і т.п. Просить допомогти харчовими посилками (2: 209, 26 April 1923).
>
> I received a letter from Hr. Kosynka. He is “politically suspect.” Claims that he belongs to my literary school, calling himself my disciple. He has sent a book of stories *Na zolotykh bohiv*. Yes, my influence is very visible in it, including the style of certain lyrical expressions, addresses to readers, etc. Asks for help with food parcels.

What is striking, however, is that all Vynnychenko’s publications in Ukraine during this period were only reprints of his earlier works (the exception being the children’s story, “Babusyn podarunok”).[29] In literary terms, he was on his way to becoming a historical figure, especially in view of the fact that there was a new generation of very talented writers. Although Vynnychenko followed Ukrainian life in the Soviet Union through periodicals, correspondence, and accounts of eyewitnesses, this was not enough for the writer. This inevitably engendered a sense of difference, otherness, and even alienation, which increased with time:

---

[29] It has not been established when Vynnychenko wrote the story “Babusyn podarunok.” It was first published in 1923 (Kyiv). The fact that Vynnychenko does not mention working on this story in his diary leads me to assume that it may have been written earlier, during his first exile.

> Але в кожному разі той факт, що якесь життя є, а по-друге, що воно цілком обходиться без нас емігрантів. І що я пишу, що думаю, що зробив, сказав і скажу, все це ні трішки нікому там не цікаве... І з цим фактом треба спокійно рахуватись і жити собі так, неначе ти без батьківщини, без громадянства, самотою на земній плянеті в товаристві з Кохою (*Shchodennyk*, 21 September 1926).

> But in any case it is a fact that life exists [in the homeland] and secondly, that it goes on completely without us, emigrants. And what I write, what I think, what I've done, said, and will say is not of the slightest interest to anybody there... And one should calmly take into account this fact and live as though you're without a homeland, without citizenship, and alone on the planet together with Kokha.

As during the first displacement, it also led Vynnychenko to strengthening the ideological aspect of his writings, which was overtly manifested in *Soniachna mashyna* and his subsequent works.

Thematically, Vynnychenko's older works seemed quite outdated, especially given their focus on pre-revolutionary reality. As the complexity of the discussion among opposing artistic movements and groups in Ukraine intensified, he seemed confused by them:

> Нічого немає в цих "молодих". Старече якась жовчність, патетична фразеологія комунізму й ніякісінького відчуття, ніякого прагнення, ніякого творення нового хоча б в уяві. Моторошна порожнеча в цих книжечках та тріскотня кулеметів, наганів, гармат. Отак вони розуміють революцію, переворот життя! (*Shchodennyk*, 13 March 1927)

> These 'young' writers have nothing. Some sort of old-age bitterness, pathetic phraseology of communism and no feeling, no aspiration, no creation of anything new if only in their imagination... A horrific emptiness and rattle of guns, revolvers, and

> machine-guns in these small books. That is how they understand revolution and life change.

When the highly acclaimed play *Narodnyi Malakhii* (1927) by Mykola Kulish, a leading playwright, appeared, it seemed almost like a critical, ironic response to Vynnychenko's attempt to introduce cardinal changes in human moral and relationships. Iurii Smolych, a well-known writer and critic of the 1920s, notes in his memoirs:

> In his conversations Kulish ridiculed Vynnychenko's notion of 'the reform of man' and considered it politically important, because, as is known, Vynnychenko's authority—as a writer, playwright, kulturträger, moralist, 'Europeanizer,' and even politician—was quite high among the masses (1986, 61).

Vynnychenko was also at risk of becoming 'diasporized,' as his new works were appearing only in the diaspora. For instance, *Hrikh*, *Zakon* and *Na toi bik* appeared in Prague as publications of the journal *Nova Ukraina*. His works were also published in the newspaper *Ukrains'ki shchodenni visti* [Ukrainian Daily News] (New York, 1920-21), and his play *Bazar* was published in Winnipeg (1920). His plays were staged by some émigré theatres (e.g., in Winnipeg, Edmonton, Fort William,[30] Chicago, Czechoslovakia). It is interesting to note that a theatre in Iablunove (Czechoslovakia) (Narizhnyi 1: 59) and a theatrical society in Winnipeg (*Almanakh*, 229) were named after Vynnychenko.

Another conflict that betrays Vynnychenko's state of ambiguity is the clash between politics and literature. The collapse of Ukrainian statehood and the defeat of the revolution, to which he had totally devoted himself for twenty years, was a huge disappointment for him. Moreover, the revolution was defeated not by monarchist forces but by the Bolsheviks, his former colleagues and allies with whom he had collaborated and shared the difficulties of pre-war exile. This became even more painful when his attempt to join the Bolshevik Party and remain in Ukraine failed. Just how actively he plunged into political activity one can see from his publications in *Nova doba* and *Nova Ukraina*, membership in the foreign branch of the Ukrainian Communist Party, and other activities. Such a political stance can be explained by his recent involvement in the Ukrainian revolution as one of its leaders. It also motivated him to respond actively to the situation in his homeland—just as he had during the first displacement. But this time it was short-lived and done almost as if through inertia. His rift with the Bolsheviks and the diaspora, as well as the refusal to collaborate with Western states, minimized his effectiveness and thus led him more into the domain of literature and ideology.

---

[30] On the staging of Vynnychenko's plays in Canada, see Kravchuk, Petro (pp. 427-468).

After his political defeat, Vynnychenko believed literature would be a relevant domain into which to channel his creative energy. Before his final departure, he contemplated his literary career and came to the conclusion that it would be better for him to deal with literature abroad: "[That's why] after the end of the war I prefer to move somewhere abroad, where I feel much better than in my homeland" [...[A] через те я волію, по скінченні війни. Виїхати кудись за кордон, де я себе почуваю далеко ліпше, ніж на своїй батьківщині] (qt. in Chykalenko 1931, 493).[31] A few years later he reflected on this matter again and admitted that it would be difficult to write at home:

> Я можу робити, що хочу. Питання стоїть тільки так: куди мені їхати—на Україну чи за кордон. Робити в політичній сфері я не можу ні там, ні там. Єдина робота—літературно-наукова. Умови для цеї роботи на Україні надзвичайно важкі, майже неможливі (*Shchodennyk* 1: 442, 19 June 1920).
>
> I can do whatever I want. The only question is where to go—to Ukraine or abroad. I cannot work in the political sphere either there or here. The only work is

---

[31] In his *Shchodennyk* [Diary] Chykalenko did not provide an exact date for this remark, but from the context one can assume that it refers to the period 1915-16, for he also discussed the events of World War I and Vynnychenko's plays, which were being staged in Moscow and St. Petersburg.

> literature and scholarship. The conditions for this work in Ukraine are extraordinarily difficult, almost impossible.

Vynnychenko saw himself for a while as a kind of a writer-nomad, a person who stays in places where he feels comfortable but endowed with the possibility of traveling home and writing for a Ukrainian audience. But now the writer was conscious of continuing his literary career abroad. This was a significant transformation in comparison to his first displacement: then he complained about his absence from the homeland and about the lack of fresh impressions. For a person deeply rooted in his country and preoccupied with its political and cultural emancipation, it was a bitter truth to admit to this new exile.

More and more often Vynnychenko considered putting an end to politics and indulging completely in literature. He writes in his diary: "[I] am going abroad; [I] am shaking off all the dust of politics, I will surround myself with books and plunge into the only true matter: literature... I am leaving as a writer, and I want to die as a politician with all my heart" [[Я] їду за кордон, обтрусюю з себе всякий порох політики, обгороджуюсь книжками й поринаю в своє справжнє, єдине діло—літературу... *Я* їду як письменник, а як політик я всією душею хочу померти] (*Shchodennyk* 1: 446, 15 July 1920). Contemplating his immanent move to Europe, he becomes energized at the thought of focusing on his literary career:

> Мене бере туга. Чогось мені тяжко і тоскно. Чого? Того, що кидаю Україну? Революцію? Що виходжу з рядів діючої армії? Що вчуваю провал всієї справи? Мабуть, все разом. І не доходить до серця хвилюючою радістю думка, що, нарешті, кинусь до роботи. Ще не доходить. Але знаю, що дійде. Бо активність і творчість, в чому б то не було, є найбільша, самоцінна сатисфакція. Великий, невмирущий закон "бути цінним для колективу" лишається на кожному місці. Бути цінним для інших і чесним з собою—це найвищі закони і найвища

> насолода для кожної людини. Змогти здійснити ці закони—це змогти мати щастя. Страждання, туга, сум, жаль—це ті вогники душі, на яких гартується всепрощаюча об'єктивність творчости. Ситий спокій, самовдоволена втома і певність в своїй безпомильності—убивають дух шукання і творіння. Спасибі тузі, що стискує мені серце (ibid., 1: 481-82, 16 September 1920).

> I am filled with an ache. Why is it so difficult and sad? Why? Because I'm abandoning Ukraine? The revolution? Because I am exiting the ranks of an active army? Because I predict the failure of the entire cause? Maybe everything together. And the exciting thought that I will finally plunge into work doesn't reach my heart. Not yet. But I know it will come. Because an active position and creativity, no matter what they concern, provide the most intrinsic satisfaction. The great eternal law "to be of value to the collective" is always vital. To be of value to others and honest with oneself are the highest laws and the greatest pleasure for every person. To be able to implement these laws is to be able to have happiness. Suffering, longing, sadness, and sorrow are those little fires of the soul on which the all-forgiving objectivity of writing is tempered. Sated peace, self-satisfied fatigue and confidence in one's faultlessness kill the spirit of quest and creation. Thank you to the longing that squeezes my heart.

However, Vynnychenko never lost his interest in politics and saw literature as a means of serving the revolution in ideological terms. His pen had to become his sword:

> І чи не розумніше, не моральніше, не корисніше для революції й комунізму, коли виїду за кордон, закопаюсь у тихе містечко, обгородюсь до політичних хвиль і весь порину в роботу на користь дійсній правді, дійсному, не комісарському, комунізмові? (ibid., 1: 456, 24 July 1920)

> Wouldn't it be wiser, more moral and useful for the revolution and communism to go abroad, to hide in a quiet town, to fence myself from political waves and to plunge into work that is more useful for real truth and for real communism, not communism directed by commissars?

This tension between politics and literature, ideology and aesthetics was quite explicitly revealed during his first displacement and concretely outlined in his article

"Sposterezhennia neprofesionala" (cf. 58-60). In fact, this dilemma never left Vynnychenko after 1920 and constantly influenced his writings. Andrii Richyts'kyi in his *Vynnychenko v literaturi i politytsi* [Vynnychenko in Literature and Politics] (Kharkiv, 1928) admitted that it is impossible to study Vynnychenko's works without taking into account his passion for politics.

All these tensions between the national and social, the diaspora and the Bolsheviks, politics and literature resulted in Vynnychenko's inner struggle, which ranged from a universal wish to embrace the whole world to a feeling of existential emptiness and a desire to escape from this world. The study of the writer's diary exposes the problem. The most essential characteristic of this period is probably what Vynnychenko called "an atmosphere of uncertainty": "In general, we live in an atmosphere of uncertainty and vagueness in everything... Everything is in a gray, boring fog, so that it's impossible even to outline the contours properly" [Взагалі ми живемо в атмосфері непевности, невизначености в усьому... Все в сіренькому, нудному тумані, навіть контурів намітити не можна як слід] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 276, 7 January 1924).

The writer's uncertainty during this period was exacerbated by the crisis and chaos unfolding in Germany. "The turmoil in Germany is acquiring a Russian character" [Колотнеча в Німеччині набирає російського характеру], notes Vynnychenko on 3 November 1923 (ibid., 2: 247). He observes cardinal negative changes in German society, which was disheartened by defeat:

> Їхня воля занепала... Чесність, гідність, брутальна непідкупність перетворились у підкупність, у запобігання перед грошовито-сильними, у розпусту хабарництва, шахрайства, шантажу і дрібного та й великого злодійства.

> Нещастя, злидні, приниження рідко створюють героїв, а частіше злодіїв (ibid., 2: 300, 29 February 1924).
>
> Their will has declined... Honesty, dignity, and brutal incorruptibility have turned into corruptibility, reverence for the power of rich people, the degeneracy of bribery, fraud, blackmail, and petty and large-scale crime. Calamity, misery, and humiliation rarely create heroes, but more often criminals.

Even though Vynnychenko had earned enough money to buy a cozy house in Rauen near Berlin, he nevertheless felt very vulnerable because of the Germans' hostile attitude toward foreigners. This includes, for example, raids by financial inspectors demanding foreign currency (ibid., 2: 260, 28 December 1923). To some extent he develops the syndrome of an "ausländer," who feels unprotected in the hostland. Concerning his conflicts with German publishers, Vynnychenko points out: "I received the news from Kiepenheuer that he and Specht stole *Chorna Pantera* and sold it in the USA. A letter of protest against the theft. But how will this help? In today's German courts all cases between a foreigner and a German end in favour of the latter" [Сповіщення від Кіпенгойєра, що він з Шпехтом украв "Чорну Пантеру", продавши її в Америку. Лист з протестом проти крадіжки. Що то поможе? В німецькому сучасному суді всі процеси чужинця з німцем кінчаються на користь останнього] (ibid., 2: 207, 12 April 1923). On the other hand, Vynnychenko's dividedness under these difficult social conditions is evident from the sympathy he shows for his hostland: "One could live here, if one could get rid of the ability to react to the suffering of the local society. But when this is not possible, and when one has to react to everything that poor Germany is experiencing, then there can't be any peace" [Можна б жити, аби ж тільки позбавитись здатности реагування на чужі переживання. Коли ж цього нема, коли мусиш реагувати на все, чим живе бідна Німеччина, тоді спокою не може бути] (ibid., 2: 251, 15 November 1923).

Like other émigrés, Vynnychenko expected that the Soviet regime would collapse in 1925, and he would be able to return home. Early that year he noted the following:

> Обдумування нової праці гальмується непевністю нашого становища. Емігрантські руські газети віщують на цей рік поворот до Росії.
>
> Цей рік є віщований і мною в 20-му році як рік загибелі большевизму. Цікаво, чи мої розрахунки справдяться? (ibid., 2: 487, 5 January 1925)

> Reflections on the new work are impeded by the uncertainty of our situation. Russian émigré newspapers are predicting a return to Russia for this year.
>
> In 1920 I myself predicted that this year would be the year of the fall of Bolshevism. I wonder if my predictions will come true?

The writer tried to reflect philosophically on his new displacement. He began to treat all his problems as "small losses" that paled in the face of the possibilities of self-perfection and universalism: "It [displacement] doesn't oppress me with a dreary feeling because the value of my life and its sense is now broader and richer for me. And this richness is occasionally generous and is not afraid of small losses" [Це не стискує мене тоскним почуттям, бо цінність життя і його сенс тепер для мене є ширший, багатший. А багатство раз-у-раз щедре і не боїться невеликих утрат], writes Vynnychenko (ibid., 2: 118, 31 March 1922). This readiness to reconcile with his displacement was something new that did not happen during 1907-14. Interestingly, I was not able to find any notes expressing Vynnychenko's exilic wish for an immediate return, as he did in his letters to Chykalenko earlier. Two weeks later he wrote the following:

> Мій перелом, як ця весна. Неначе зненацька, наче несподівано замість тоскного, морозячого туману в душі, замість холодної, безнадійної сльоти, крізь яку не видно нічого вперед і на п'ять кроків, через яку весь світ здається вогкою,

> слизькою й темною ковбанею—замість цього "раптом" п'янкий вітер, сонце, молоді, жилаві, уперті зелені бруньки, безмежний простір блакиті, галас і гомін усього живого (ibid., 2: 121, April 14 1922).
>
> My breakthrough is like this spring. As though out of the blue, unexpectedly instead of the boring and freezing fog in my soul, instead of the chilly, hopeless sleet through which nothing can be seen five steps ahead and through which the whole world looks like a damp, slimy, and dark puddle, instead of this there "suddenly" appears an intoxicating wind, the sun, young, wiry, willful green buds, an immense space of azure, and the cries and noise of everything living.

The "breakthrough," however, was not necessarily complete. Quite often Vynnychenko's optimism alternated with apathy, hopelessness, boredom, and escapist ideas. For instance, delighted with his purchase of a house in Rauen, in "Mönchwinkel" [Monk's corner], he soon experiences a sense of disillusionment: "We escaped into this solitude, into this sadness of the winds, into long autumn evenings for the sake of something greater, for the future. We relied on our inner essence from which we find the meaning of our life. And we whined so early on?" [Ми втекли в цю самоту, в цей сум вітрів, у довгі осінні вечори заради більшого, задля дальшого. Ми понадіялись на свою внутрішню сутність, з якої черпаємо зміст свого життя. І так рано заскавучали?] (ibid., 2: 235, 26 September 1923).

Whereas during his first displacement, when escapist notes flashed by practically unnoticed, now they are present frequently. Elaborating on this escapist mood the next day, Vynnychenko tries to reconcile it with the potential that isolation can offer him:

> Виникнення ідеї: відійти на 5 літ од зовнішнього, політичного, громадського і приватно-товариського світу. Продати віллу в Рауені й переїхати до Італії, сховавши від усіх своє місце перебування й порвавши зв'язки абсолютно з усіма людьми, близькими й далекими... На п'ять літ самота, праця, самозаглиблення, заспокоєння всіх часових, поверхових інтересів. Слава,

> багатство, влада, честолюбність, це випадає з кола моїх інтересів (ibid., 2: 237, 27 September 1923).

> The idea crops up: to leave the external, political, public, and private-social world for five years. To sell the villa in Rauen and move to Italy, hiding my place of residence from everyone and severing contacts with absolutely all people, close friends and acquaintances... Solitude, work, introversion, and calming down from all temporal superficial interests for five years. Glory, wealth, power, and ambition—all this will disappear from the circle of my interests.

Almost a year later the writer expressed the same thought. Ideas of escape had begun to haunt him. The desire to transform himself metaphorically into a small insect conveys his reluctance or even fear of engaging in public activity:[32]

> Жагуче хочеться забратись кудись у якусь щілину на земній плянеті, уявити себе кузочкою, мертвим і так прожити хоч років зо два! І не боятись Молоха громадськости, не приносити йому в жертву своєї волі, праці, існування (ibid., 2: 359, 11 June 1924).

> I passionately wish to crawl somewhere into a crack on the planet and pretend that I am a small insect, dead, and to live like that for at least two years! And not be afraid of the Moloch of society, not sacrifice my will, work, and existence to it.

The dream of isolation was an attempt to ease his anxiety and perception of life's absurdity. Soon Rauen seemed to be a prison: "Extraordinary outbursts of longing, emptiness, hopelessness, colourlessness, and purposelessness of the world and life... Rauen is like a prison, and the world is boring. [My] frightened imagination is looking for a more attractive place on the planet—everything is boring" [Надзвичайний вибух тоскности, порожнечі, безнадійности, безбарвности й безцільности світу й життя... Раен—як тюрма, світ—нудний. Злякана уява шукає привабливого місця на плянеті—все нудно] (ibid., 2: 366, 24 June 1924). His plans included leaving Europe for South America, Africa, or an island—so that no one would bother him. Vynnychenko was thus caught between his wish to embrace the whole world and to escape from it.

---

[32] This is reminiscent of Gregor's transformation into a cockroach in Franz Kafka's story "The Metamorphosis."

Along with the feeling that life was absurd, there also appeared a sense of aversion to it: "A feeling of disgust and boredom from the absurdity of life" [Почування огиди й нудьги від безглуздя життя], he notes in his diary (ibid., 2: 448, 26 November 1924). His loneliness was exacerbated by his disillusionment in people around him:

> Гидко до млости від слабости нещасних людців, готових повзати перед матеріяльною, фізично-грошовою силою. Ну, хай коряться, хай не кидаються в нерівний і непотрібний бій, але хай не плазують, хай коряться мовчки, з гідністю. Не знаю людей, яких не можна купити,—серед моїх знайомих таких немає. Є тільки питання суми. Від старих до молодих (ibid.).

> It is disgusting to the point of nausea [to see] the weakness of miserable little people who fawn before material and financial power. Well, let them submit, they shouldn't throw themselves into an unequal and useless battle, but they shouldn't crawl, they should submit silently and with dignity. I don't know any people who can't be bought—there are none among my acquaintances. It is only a question of the amount. From the old to the young.

In another entry we read Vynnychenko's complaints about his loss of identity. He felt uprooted, unable to adjust to his displacement, even though he claimed to have universal ideas:

> Хтось інший за мене дивиться на мене і сумно дивується: чому ти тут, в якомусь малесенькому німецькому селі, у німецькій хаті, яку чомусь звеш своєю; чого, як мокрий осінній листок, пригнало тебе [сюди] й приліпило тут, у цьому кутку нерідної землі? Дивуюся, а, здається, за двадцять три роки життя [у вигляді] осіннього листа повинен би вже привчитись і звикнути до прилипаня по нерідних кутках рідної плянети (ibid., 2: 257, 13 December 1923).

> Somebody else, instead of me, is looking at me and is sadly astonished: why are you here, in a small German village, in a German house, which you for some reason call your own; what drove and stuck you [here], in this corner of a foreign land, [like] a wet autumn leaf? I am surprised, but it seems to me that after twenty-three years of life [in the form of a] fall leaf I should have already learned and become accustomed to sticking to foreign corners of my native planet.

This sense of uprootedness at *this* particular period and historical juncture was experienced by other displaced writers, among them Maxim Gorky. Both Vynnychenko and Gorky were the most popular writers in their respective homelands at the beginning of the twentieth century. They shared many ideological and artistic views and were affected by the political change in the Russian Empire and the new Soviet state. The two writers lived in displacement for quite a long time, being out of favour with both the tsarist and Bolshevik regimes, although Gorky would eventually succumb and return to Russia in 1933.[33] It remains a mystery whether Maxim Gorky went abroad in 1921 voluntarily or not. Angry at the Bolsheviks and despised by Russian émigrés, he wrote in a letter to Rolland that he had lost faith in Russia (qt. in Vaksberg, 150). Called "a petty-bourgeois fellow-traveler" [poputchik] by the Bolsheviks, Gorky was also waiting for the collapse of Bolshevism. In his letter to Rolland dated 21 April 1923 he confessed that he did not even want to return to his homeland: "I don't have any wish to return to Russia. I would not be able to write, if I have to spend my time only to reiterate the refrain "Do not kill" (ibid., 168). A few months later (15 January 1924) he wrote to Rolland: "I will not return to Russia, and I am feeling more and more like a man without a homeland" (ibid., 177).

---

[33] Gorky—1906-1913 and 1921-1933; Vynnychenko—1907-1914 and 1920-1951.

Similarly, Vynnychenko felt that he was a man uprooted from his homeland and searching for a new identity in displacement. One extreme response to his displacement was the thought of death, which visited Vynnychenko and his wife:

> Коха призналась у сумній речі: часом з'являються думки про смерть. Жити часом стає нудно. Значить, така вже втома. Мій аргумент: смерть ще безглуздіша, ніж найбезглуздіше життя. Треба боротись з утомою і знесиллям. Сильні і здорові про смерть не думають (*Shchodennyk* 2: 224, 23 July 1923).[34]

> Kokha confessed something sad: sometimes she has thoughts about death. Sometimes it becomes boring to live. This means that the exhaustion is so great. My argument: death is even more absurd than the most absurd life. One should fight against exhaustion and impotence. Strong and healthy people don't think about death.

In any case, the writer did not tolerate the existing reality and found himself facing a dilemma: to change the world or seek isolation from it.

3.4. From Old Themes to Visions of Utopia

Here I would like to examine how Vynnychenko's works written during the period 1920-25 reflect his displacement. As mentioned above, Vynnychenko achieved all his success mainly through his old works that were written during his first displacement (*Brekhnia* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*). But what about his new works? How do they relate to his second displacement? During his stay in Germany he was quite productive as a writer, managing to write such works as *Zakon*, *Pisnia Izrailia*, *Na toi bik*, two children's stories based on folklore motifs, and the three-volume novel *Soniachna mashyna*.[35] In general, these works reiterate his old themes based on his past experiences and add little to his writings in terms of reflecting a new revolutionary and post-revolutionary reality as well as his new émigré experience. Only *Soniachna mashyna* revealed a cardinal shift in his thematic and stylistic interests toward utopian and adventure narratives and in many respects defined his present as strongly focused on his visions of the future.

---

[34] Suicide was a case for some émigrés to overcome their displacement, as that of Shraider, whom Vynnychenko mentioned in his diary (7 January 1926).

[35] The diary indicates that Vynnychenko wrote a work called "Zlochynstvo" [Crime] but it was never published (2: 55, 20 October 1921).

The play *Zakon* (1921) can be seen as a continuation of a traditional Vynnychenko theme that he had already elaborated in *Memento* (1909) and *Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelia* (1917): family relationships, the rational and irrational, desire for maternity and the paternal instinct. Perfectly written, with a small set of characters and concise composition, *Zakon* embodies the best characteristics of Vynnychenko-the-writer. From the perspective of his contemporaries, however, both Soviet and émigré, he seemed outdated. Ievhen Malaniuk, a prominent émigré himself, commented that *Zakon* (written just before he started *Soniachna mashyna*) was preoccupied with old themes:

> To lead the Ukrainian revolution for so long a time, to watch and (perhaps) experience so much, and at the same time to remain in the summer of 1922 in the same narrow and long-familiar circle of 'sexual issues,' elaborated by Artsybashev and Kamenskii,—this is an astonishing and strange spiritual petrification" (qt. in Moroz, 79).

While one-sided, this criticism states a certain truth: Vynnychenko still had the tendency of reverting to his old themes and was reluctant to elaborate new ones. In this period he did not produce any work based on his present experience of an émigré, such as "Taina," *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, "Olaf Stefenzon" or *Rivnovaha.*

The play *Pisnia Izrailia* (alternate title: *Kol-Nidre*, a famous Jewish song), completed in November 1921 (revised in June 1922),[36] takes us to the revolution of 1905 and Jewish pogroms—an issue that Vynnychenko raised in his first play *Dyzharmoniia* (1906). In depicting the social and cultural emancipation of Jews in the Russian Empire, the writer also emphasized internal problems within the Jewish community, which was still governed by prejudice and religious dogmas. Soviet literary critics, while acknowledging the playwright's technical skills, criticized *Pisnia Izrailia* for being anachronistic from the point of view of the "era of socialist construction":

---

[36] The play was first published in Ukraine (Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. *Pisnia Izrailia*. Kharkiv: Rukh, 1930).

> *Kol-Nidre* is written now, after the revolution, on a pre-Revolutionary topic. But it gives the impression that it should have appeared at least 10-12 years ago. Then, maybe, it would had been understandable and maybe had success. Now no one can explain why the author, who experienced the revolution, has chosen this 'Judeophile' interpretation of the topic... Still, in its own way as popular naturalistic melodrama, *Kol-Nidre* is constructed quite skillfully and effectively for the stage, satisfying genre and commercial demands 100% (Smolych 1993, 130-131).

Being probably of less importance for Soviet Ukrainian literature focused largely on recent events of the revolution and Civil war during 1917-20, *Pisnia Izrailia*, on the other hand, could raise more interest in the West where the Jewish question became an important issue through the 1920-30s. In particular, Jewish pogroms in Germany in the early 1920s made it a timely topic. Vynnychenko's thorough exploration of the problem resulted also in an article, "Ievreis'ke pytannia na Ukraini" [The Jewish Question in Ukraine] (*Nova Ukraina* 7-8 (1923): 20-31).

The writer's focus on old moral themes may be also explained by his commercial interest. Having found himself without funds in a foreign country, he could still count on the staging of his plays. The success of *Brekhnia* and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* in various European countries proved that earlier. *Zakon* was also a successful undertaking, albeit not to such a degree. It ran in L'viv (*Shchodennyk* 2: 59, 19 November 1921) and was planned for the "Odeon" theatre in Paris (a certain Shapiro promised to promote the play) (ibid., 2: 145, 26 September 1922). The play was also published by the Russian émigré publisher ("Vozrozhdeniie") in Berlin (1922), but there is no evidence that it was staged in a Russian theatre.

Pisnia Izrailia specifically targeted Jewish audiences in the West. The play was accepted for staging by a Jewish theatre in the USA (ibid., 2: 143, 13 September 1922). Rosalia informed Vynnychenko about the prepayment of three million German marks (ibid., 2: 148, 15 October 1922). The writer was counting on buying a new house after selling the play (ibid., 2: 155, 24 December 1922). However, it is not clear if Vynnychenko received the money, as he borrowed 100 million marks from Mykola Vasyl'ko, an ambassador of the UNR to Germany and Switzerland (1920-24) for the purchase (Motyl and Kostiuk, 20). While in France, he planned to stage the play in a French theatre with the support of the Jewish community: "There is an idea to push *Pisnia Izrailia* onto the French stage. The Jewish community should support it and provide financial success. Unfortunately, in these accursed circumstances, this [theme] is promoting itself" [Думка пропхати "Пісню Ізраїля" на французьку сцену. Жидівство повинно пітримати і дати матеріяльний успіх. А серед цих проклятих обставин це, на жаль, тепер висувається наперед] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 649, 16 November 1925).

While working on *Soniachna mashyna*, Vynnychenko simultaneously wrote a few children's stories: "Stelysia, barvinku, nyzen'ko" and "Viiut' vitry, viiut' buini" [The Wild Winds Blow] (1922). They were a part of huge project—a ten-volume series of children's stories called *Namysto*, each volume consisting of ten stories (called "strings"). But only one volume appeared in 1930 in Ukraine (Kharkiv: Rukh). The writer could hardly count on the stories' commercial success, considering that his access to the Ukrainian market was limited by this time. It is also unknown if he offered them to a publisher in the diaspora. It was only owing to the short-lived period of political liberalization in the Soviet Union that Vynnychenko managed to publish the book (it included only one of the stories, "Viiut' vitry buini," and seven other stories written during 1928-29).[37]

From the perspective of displacement his children's stories, as I argued in the previous chapter, may be considered a manifestation of nostalgia, which works to sustain one's identity in extreme circumstances. The stories are an imaginary return to his past, a kind of escape, where the writer tries to find a reliable home. They hark back to his earlier narratives of the pre-revolutionary period ("Kumediia z Kostem" and "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk"). "Stelysia, barvinku, nyzen'ko" recounts the youthful love of two gymnasium students, Krupyts'kyi and Masiuchenko, for their classmate, Dina, and their adventures. Dina sings a folk song "Stelysia, barvinku, nyzen'ko," which is also the title of the story. In Ukrainian culture the periwinkle flower (barvinok) is a symbol of joyful vitality, spring awakening, and virginity.[38] The combination of a music and symbolic imagery creates a complex lyrical mood, which is reinforced by a long emotional prologue about the beautiful spring landscape of a Ukrainian town (93-94). The story was written during one spring day, and the writer signed it in the following way: "Zehlendorf. Forest. Sofa. 28 April 1922."[39]

The title of another story, "Viiut' vitry, viiut' buini," is also taken from a folk song. It is full of concern, future uncertainty and intimation of horrible changes. The mother of a six-year old boy named Hryn' goes to a friend's wedding and leaves her son with a nine-year old babysitter named San'ka. Hryn' is afraid to be alone and asks the girl to stay with him and tell him a fairy tale. San'ka plays with him, trades candies, and, finally, tells him a fairy tale. After San'ka tells him the story, Hryn' suddenly asks her to sing a song. The short story ends with a very lyrical scene:

---

[37] "Stelysia, barvinku, nyzen'ko" was published in 1960.
[38] See in more detail http://www.ukrlife.org/main/evshan/symbol_b.htm [13 April 2005].
[39] Zehlendorf is a suburb of Berlin.

> Санька вміє тоненько-тоненько і так жалібно співати.
>
> Вітер у димарі затихає, потім ніжно гуде, наче старий Кузьма у сопілку. Дощу не чути за вікном. Лампадка часто-часто кліпає, ніби набігли їй сльози на око.
>
> Санька зітхає, мовчить і тихенько-тихенько заводить:
>
> *Віють вітри, віють буйні,*
> *Аж дерева гнуться.*
> *Ох, як болить моє серце,*
> *Самі сльози ллються* (26).

> San'ka sings in a very clear, high voice and ever so plaintively.
>
> The wind in the chimney dies down, then hums tenderly, like old man Kuz'ma with his pan-pipe. You cannot hear the sound of the rain outside the window. The little icon-lamp blinks as though tears have come to its eye.
>
> San'ka sighs, doesn't say a word, and then starts singing very quietly:
>
> *The winds blow, the wild winds,*
> *So that trees bend down.*
> *Oh, how my heart aches*
> *And tears drop down.*

The use of song elements attests to the author's lyrical mood. Moreover, the song becomes an organizing centre of the narrative, a kind of motto, from which the narrative unravels. Significantly, all his subsequent children's stories, written in France in 1928-29, were also titled after phrases from folk songs.

The novel *Na toi bik* was the only work in which Vynnychenko elaborated on his recent revolutionary experiences. He started writing it in 1919 in Austria (Semmering) and finished it in 1923 in Rauen. It is evident from the diary that in Rauen he worked on the novel from 16 October to 25 November, simultaneously with *Soniachna mashyna*. It was published in *Nova Ukraina* (Prague, 1923, nos. 11-12) and as a separate edition (Prague: Nova Ukraina, 1924). Thematically, it echoes the play *Mizh dvokh syl* (1919), in which the writer touches upon the tragic events of Ukraine's struggle for independence in the wake of the collapse of the Russian Empire. But how can we relate *Na toi bik* with other works in this period and how does it reflect Vynnychenko's displacement? What is striking here is the fact that Vynnychenko started the novel in 1919 and finished it only four years later. Resuming his work, the writer did not make any comments in his diary, indicating simply the number of hours he spent on writing. Also, he would have hardly experienced any technical difficulties with the publication of an intriguing "patriotic" novel in the disapora, inasmuch as he had already managed to publish his plays featuring old moral themes (e.g., *Hrikh* and *Zakon*). It may be assumed that his initial interest in the novel had probably waned, and he started other literary projects (e.g., *Zakon*, *Pisnia Izrailia* and *Namysto*), at the same time focusing on the promotion of his plays in Europe. The motivation to resume work on *Na toi bik* in 1923 could be explained by his growing sense of uprootedness, which revealed itself explicitly after the crisis in Germany in 1923. From this perspective *Na toi bik* betrays some exilic features of a return to the past, and this work is imbued with a certain amount of lyricism. Even if the work is devoted to the recent revolutionary past, according to Oleksandr Hozhyk's observation, it contains digressions into the childhood of the main protagonist, the doctor Mykhailo Verkhodub.

The same digression is also pertinent for another protagonist, Ol'ha Chorniavs'ka. Her nostalgic feeling about the steppe is imbued with a high degree of intimacy, so that it cannot be shared with anyone, except compatriots. She says to Dr. Verkhodub: "Well, it's a good thing that you're a countryman! I'm very glad. And here I was thinking… Well, nothing. And what can be better than the steppe, our steppe? Eh? No one understands and cannot understand us. Am I right?" [Ну, це добре, що ви—земляк! Я дуже рада. А я було думала... Ну, нічого. А що може бути краще від степу, нашого степу? Га? Ніхто не розуміє й не може нас зрозуміти. Правда?] (56). Chorniavs'ka is depicted as an ideal Ukrainian woman whose "face is washed with the spirit of the steppe" and who is visited by "the wisdom of the steppe" (55). But in general, she is preoccupied with the present and is going to sacrifice her life for the freedom of her homeland. In this sense, she reminds us of the characters in *Rivnovaha*, who returned home to carry on their struggle for the revolutionary cause.

From these examples we can see that at the beginning of his new displacement Vynnychenko preferred to remain on "familiar territory" (all the works are set in Ukraine) and referred mainly to his early experiences (except *Na toi bik*). Whereas during his first exile Vynnychenko wrote extensively about the revolution of 1905-1907 and its aftermath, now it seemed to be quite paradoxical that he was not focusing on the theme of the revolutionary events of 1917-1920, which were even more radical and tragic. To some extent this lacunae was compensated by his journalistic (publications in *Nova doba*, *Nova Ukraina*, and other periodicals) and memoir (*Vidrodzhennia natsii*) writings. In the case of the latter, Vynnychenko appeared as a politician who, as a former leader of the

Ukrainian revolution, was preoccupied with giving a historical report on recent events. In his preface to *Vidrodzhennia natsii* he wrote:

> Я беру на себе трудну річ: дати повну, правдиву картину боротьби українства за визволення своєї нації під час і після Великої Російської Революції... Моя мета перейти через усі етапи недавно-минулого, зв`язати їх, одкинути неважне й дати суцільний образ цих і радісних, і болючих часів нашої нещасної історії (1: 9-10).

> I am taking a difficult task upon myself: to present a full and objective picture of the Ukrainians' struggle for the liberation of their nation during and after the Great Russian Revolution… My goal is to cover all the stages of the recent past, tie them together, omit the inessential, and to give a complete picture of these both joyful and painful times in our unhappy history.

At the same time, the writings of his contemporaries, both émigrés and those who remained in Ukraine, were permeated almost exclusively by recent developments. Malaniuk, for instance, broadly reflects on recent events and his own state of displacement in the collection of poems under the rather symbolic title, *Stylet i Stylos* [Stiletto and Stylus] (1925). In Ukraine the leading prose writer Mykola Khvylovyi gives a very vivid and colourful account of recent revolutionary events in such stories as "Ia" (Romantyka) [I (A Romantic Story)], "Kit u chobotiakh" [Puss in Boots] and "Lehenda" [Legend], etc. Although it might look strange that Vynnychenko did not respond creatively to the current events in Ukraine, from our perspective this inability may be explained by the difficulties of his displacement and sense of uprootedness.

Interestingly, although all of Vynnychenko's works just mentioned were written after 1920, scholars usually include these works in the second period of Vynnychenko's creativity (1907-1920), the period of moral and psychological dramas and novels (cf. Zerov, 440-441). Only *Soniachna mashyna* is treated as the beginning of the writer's new stage. This kind of disparity is important for us, as it attests to the general model of the writer's evolution from familiar to unfamiliar territory in displacement. This is the pattern of Vynnychenko's writings in the period of his first displacement during 1907-1914: at the beginning he was oriented exclusively toward a Ukrainian setting and then began to observe local life. The only difference is that his early displacement was much milder; he was a young expatriate who was looking forward to contributing to social and national liberation. Psychologically, Vynnychenko gravitated to Ukraine and returned home even in the face of the danger. In that period Vynnychenko made little effort to publish his prose or stage his plays in translation in Europe. Images of Ukrainians are present in all his works with a foreign setting—"Taina," *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, *Rivnovaha* and "Olaf Stefenzon"—and in which they play major roles. Even in the latter work everything is viewed through the prism of an unnamed Ukrainian, although all the other characters are foreign migrants. These works were written above all for Ukrainian and/or Russian audiences, and they were quickly published.

The gravitation to the homeland during 1907-14 was transformed during the second displacement into a new orientation toward a broader international cultural space, a space in which Vynnychenko tries to make a new home. This is reminiscent of Thomas Mann's transformation: "Exile has become something quite different from what it once was; it is no longer a condition of waiting programmed for an ultimate return, but rather [it] hints of the dissolution of nations and the unification of the world" (qt. in Dahlie, 202). Vynnychenko's European integration means staging his plays, ordering translations, and searching for a new audience. Going abroad, he clearly declared his goal to serve "real communism," which would include not only his country but the whole world. This led him to a reorientation toward a broad international audience. Ukraine was seen as part of that international community, and this stimulated the writer to set out on a mission. As always, we must bear in mind that Vynnychenko's sense of a universal programme stemmed from his Marxist stance, which considered the future world in egalitarian terms as one brotherhood and a community of all working people. But certainly, his new sense of belonging to the whole planet, a kind of "world citizenship," also came from his displacement. More and more often Vynnychenko speaks in terms of "my planet," "my globe," and "the earth"—something that he did not do before.

But such a universalist position is always at risk of coming into conflict with particular individual problems. Although supporting the Soviet Union ideologically, he was ignored by its rulers. Having found a quiet harbour for his intellectual activity in pre-war Europe, he now found himself more alienated and confident in its imminent fall as a bourgeois civilization regardless of the fact that it had given him asylum. The crisis in Germany also contributed to Vynnychenko's psychological ambiguity, leading to an existential self-questioning and escapism. But whereas the bitterness of his first exile could be reconciled by his return and further work in the name of the future revolution, now he was disillusioned in its results, choosing to go into European exile voluntarily and bring his ideals and beliefs to bear on an imaginary vision of a future communist society.

Vynnychenko's personal and political quandary dovetails perfectly with his world outlook, which he defines as "optimistic skepticism": "This is the worldview that corresponds best to my experience and elaborated views. My objective: to maintain my life on the path of optimistic skepticism" [Оптимістичний скептицизм. Світогляд, який найбільше відповідає моєму досвіду і виробленим поглядам. Завдання:

провадити своє життя в напрямі оптимістичного скептицизму] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 376, 14 July 1924). Because he was skeptical about the present, he directed his optimism to something beyond his reach—either in the past or in the future. In many respects, the present became intolerable for Vynnychenko. He found himself out of place and insecure in the hostland. His major work of the period, the utopian novel *Soniachna mashyna*, aptly articulated his universalist stance and served as a counterbalance to his extreme uprootedness.

3.5. Displacement and Utopia: the Novel *Soniachna mashyna* (1921-1924)

The novel *Soniachna mashyna* can be viewed as Vynnychenko's response to the new conditions of displacement and as a natural result of his literary evolution. Vynnychenko first revealed that he was thinking about a new novel on 28 June 1921 (*Shchodennyk* 2: 41). The next day he gave the project a title—*Soniachna mashyna*. It would take more than three years to finish the work on 6 July 1924, although he revised it for some time afterwards. Despite his failure to publish the novel in the diaspora and the hostland (in German, French, and English translations), he did approach Soviet representatives in Prague on 31 January 1925 (ibid., 2: 508). This was a time of liberalization in all spheres of Soviet life—economic, cultural, and political—and despite official political ostracism,[40] the negotiations were successful. Three years later two editions of *Soniachna mashyna* were released by the state publishing house DVU and a private publisher, "Rukh" [Movement]. Due to its incredible success, both publishing houses reprinted the novel (DVU in 1929; "Rukh" in 1930). DVU also published the Russian translation (1928).[41]

---

[40] The most notorious was, probably, Boris Volin's article "Prodelki Vinnichenka" [Vynnychenko's Dirty Tricks] published in the main Soviet newspaper *Izvestiia* (6 October 1925), in which he called Vynnychenko "an agent of European states." The article was a severe blow to the writer's hopes for reconciliation and led him to write to the Soviet authorities to explain his position.

Many claim that *Soniachna mashyna* is the first utopian novel in Ukrainian literature (Bilets'kyi, Zerov, and Fedchenko). But since the first utopia, Krat's *Koly ziishlo sontse* (written and published in Canada in 1918) was hardly known to readers in Ukraine, it was Vynnychenko's three-volume novel that became one of the most influential and innovative works in Ukrainian literature of the late 1920s. With *Soniachna mashyna*, Vynnychenko joined the "utopian club" and the enduring tradition of this genre. He was likely aware of the works of Nikolai Chernyshevskii, Edward Bellamy, Jack London, Karel Čapek, and Herbert Wells (Koznarsky, 48-49). Vynnychenko admired Wells as a writer and had his works in his personal library. He also made references to the English writer in his diary: "I am reading Wells's *Dream*. He borrowed my idea. I can't say that he developed it in a way that would make me envy him, but neither in a way that would prevent me from undertaking it someday" [Читаю Уеллса "Сон". Перехопив мою ідею. Не можу сказати, що він її обробив так, щоб я заздрив. Та навіть і не так, щоб я все ж таки потім колись не взявся й собі за неї] (25 April 1933). The idea of bread made by a solar machine seems to come from Wells's novel *Food of Gods* (Koznarsky, 48-49). During his work on *Soniachna mashyna* Vynnychenko also referred to works by the French writer Jules Verne, which may have helped him introduce elements of the adventure novel (*Shchodennyk* 2: 283, 22 January 1924).

---

[41] Later, the novel attracted new readers. An edition appeared in Ukraine in 1989 when the ban was lifted on the publication of Vynnychenko's works.

In 1908 on Capri Vynnychenko met the Russian novelist Aleksandr Bogdanov, the author of two socio-utopian novels, *Krasnaia zvezda* (1908) [Red Star] and *Inzhener Menni* (1912) [The Engineer Menni]. V. Revich assumes that *Krasnaia zvezda*, which depicts an ideal future communist society situated on Mars, is probably the last classical utopia in world literature. In *Inzhener Menni*, Bogdanov goes back in time and shows how working people struggled against capitalists to build such a society. *Soniachna mashyna* follows this pattern and may challenge Bogdanov's novels as the last classical utopian novel. One can find similar moments in both utopias: a peaceful revolution, the disappearance of the state as such, "effortless fulfillment of sexual desire" (Ferns, 156), unification in one world state and, eventually, a happy life. However, *Soniachna mashyna*, which was written some time later and was more ambitious, is also more complex and contains elements of dystopia and anti-utopia that add a transitional character to it. Moreover, *Krasnaia zvezda*, as Ferns puts it, "appears to pay little attention to the narrative problems of utopia as such" (154). In this respect, the narrative of *Soniachna mashyna* is also more skilful at revealing its experimental nature (i.e., the influence of Expressionism, cimematic devices, and the adventure style).

The novel as a public social phenomenon is even more significant if we take into account the contradictory opinions about it: some called it a great work, other saw it as an aesthetic failure. In a letter to Vynnychenko Hryhorii Kosynka notes: "Let me tell you what I read in the newspapers: there is a long waiting list in a Donbas library, which bought 300 copies, to borrow *Soniachna mashyna*! In short, our reader has good taste!" (*Shchodennyk*, 10 February 1928). At the same time, the leading conservative literary critic Serhii Iefremov, who often expressed disdain for Vynnychenko's experiments, intimated in his diary that the novel was a total failure: "I haven't read such a pretentious and blatant book in a long time… This is the fruit of a sick mind" (4 March 1928; 1997, 597). Among recent contemporary critics, Koznarsky calls it "one of the most optimistic and joyful works in Ukrainian literature" (181). Kaczurowskyj finds the finale of the novel "the most aesthetic picture of suicide in world literature" (2002, 163). These contradictory views were likely determined by various factors: the historical *zeitgeist* of revolutionary change, the crisis of capitalism and a search for new social forms, the totalitarian nature of the communist experiment in the USSR, the political and economic uncertainty in the world, as well as Vynnychenko's own ideological stance as a writer who was preoccupied with Marxist ideas, armed with his sense of mission to represent Ukraine in the international arena and ready to experiment with literary forms. Starting with (1) an examination of the novel's plot, structure and style, I shall then address the issues of (2) utopia as a manifestation of uprootedness; (3) the ideological and philosophical ideas in the novel; and (4) the differences in the reception of the novel in the homeland and the hostland. In my study I shall emphasize the period when the novel was being written (1921-24), although it will be necessary to extend the analysis to 1930, when it reached the broad circles of Ukrainian readers and became a fact of literary and cultural life.

3.5.1. Plot—Structure—Style

Soniachna mashyna is an eclectic and complex work. To orient the reader I will first speak briefly about the plot, structure, and style.

This utopia is set in Berlin and Germany a few dozen years after World War I, in the period of so-called hyper-capitalism. Friedrich Mertens is the president of a company, "king of rubber products" and a symbol of the new industrial and financial order that is determined to centralize all global capital and power in its own hands. Mertens is opposed by an old, dying aristocracy (the old duke Albrecht, his daughter Elisa, the Ellenberg family). Members of the underground organization called Inarac (the International Avant-Garde of Revolutionary Action) (Max Schtor, Tile, Fritz Nadel, Rinkel, Kestenbaum) resist hyper-capitalism through terrorist activity. Mertens plans to marry Elisa and thus consolidate his power. However, the conflict is resolved by an invention created by Rudolf Schtor, who creates a solar machine that produces bread from grass and solar energy. But this invention soon leads to the decline of society, as now there is no need to work and maintain social organizational structures. A group of old aristocrats wants to restore order and plots a coup, inviting the Army of Eastern States. But the adherents of the solar machine restore order themselves by organizing "creative" labour forces. They peacefully oppose themselves to the invaders, promoting the solar machine, love and creative labour. At the end 'sunism' celebrates victory and spreads all over the world.

Soniachna mashyna has the following structure: 1) anti-utopia; 2) dystopia; and 3) utopia (positive utopia).[42] The first stage shows how technical progress and the centralization of financial and political power led to a sharp polarization of rich and poor people; as a result, moral degradation and robotization embraced various strata of society that now stands on the threshold of social revolt. When the solar machine appears to offer a solution, the utopian society suddenly finds itself on the verge of a human catastrophe: with no need to work, people became virtually "chewing animals"—marking the stage of dystopia. Only the creative initiative of the Free Union of Creative Labour, which managed to draw the support of the masses for the creation of a communist society, effectively employs the advantages of solar energy and helps people realize that the solution to their problems lies above all in their inner self-organization and moral perfection.

---

[42] The structural organization and genre characteristic of the novel are developed in detail in Taras Koznarsky, *Utopia i antyutopiia v romani V. Vynnychenka "Soniachna mashyna"* [Utopia and Antiutopia in a Novel by V. Vynnychenko *Sun Machine*]. University of Alberta, 1994 (MA Thesis).

The three-part structure of this utopia, however, does not correspond exactly to each of the three volumes of the novel. Volume One has the quality of a detective novel, since it is based on the disappearance of the so-called "Siegfried's crown," a family relic of the Ellenbergs and a symbol of the German aristocracy. It appears that Rudolf Schtor used it to create his solar machine. Volume Two focuses on the struggle for the solar machine. Mertens offers Rudolf a very profitable contract. But after the inventor refuses to accept the deal, Mertens attempts to isolate Rudolf, and discredit and do away with the machine. However, its supporters establish the Committee of the Solar Machine and assist in its distribution among the masses. Volume Three complicates the situation by describing a) the decline of the society, b) the struggle for the re-establishment of order between the reactionary and progressive forces, c) showing the opposition to the invasion of the Eastern army and d) the eventual victory of the supporters of the solar machine and the spread of communism all over the world.

This variety of episodes alternates with philosophical reflections by a host of characters through whom the author articulates his critique of capitalism and his vision of communist society (I shall address this issue in Section 3.5.3.). In many respects the characters lack psychological persuasiveness, which is typical for the utopian genre. In this respect, Wells pointed out:

> There must always be a certain effect of hardness and thinness about Utopian speculations. Their common fault is to be comprehensively jejune. That which is the blood and warmth and reality of life is largely absent; there are no individualities, but only generalized people (9-10).

Whereas during his first displacement the author could search for real prototypes (e.g., in his letters he asked Chykalenko to provide details about certain people to use it in his works), now his characters had become pure constructions either of ideal people of the future (i.e., Gertruda and Rudolf) or opponents of the new order (i.e., Mertens). Especially unmotivated is Mertens's transformation from a capitalist tycoon into an advocate of the solar machine and his membership in the Free Union of Creative Labour.

These myriad events and winding plot are to a large extent subject to an experimental stylistic approach that includes expressionist and cinematic techniques, mixed with elements of the adventure story. Vynnychenko undoubtedly wanted to include some entertainment value in *Soniachna mashyna*, creating a spectacle-like novel, a *roman-vydovyshche*, according to Koznarsky. Critics are almost unanimous in their view that *Soniachna mashyna* signifies a cardinal shift in Vynnychenko's literary style (Zerov, Pohorilyi, Syvachenko 1998) from realistic and impressionistic writing to a more pronounced non-realistic style. Certainly, the writer's stay in Europe, particularly in Weimar Germany, played a role in this. The critic Ivan Lakyza directly connects Vynnychenko's literary evolution with his displacement: "Vynnychenko's stay abroad and his retreat from active political activity is likely to influence him as a writer: he has now acquired the formal mastery of a European writer... The European school and European literary skill are clearly seen in this Vynnychenko novel" (101).

Expressionism was probably the most visible stylistic device that left its imprint on Vynnychenko's utopia. Syvachenko in her article "*Soniachna mashyna* V. Vynnychenka v mahichnomu koli ekspresionizmu" [V. Vynnychenko's *The Solar Machine* in the Magical Circle of Expressionism] finds that Expressionism was "extremely relevant to Vynnychenko's sensibility" (71) and largely informed by Vynnychenko's displacement. The critic presents the broad context of German Expressionism, which may have influenced his interest in this artistic style. In particular, she speaks about the "ideological underpinning" in the literary works of Kaiser (*Die Koralle*, 1917; *Gas I*, 1918; and *Gas II*, 1920), and Toller (*Masse-Mensch*, 1921 and *Die Maschinenstürmer*, 1922), "enlarging of repugnant phenomena" [укрупнення огидних явищ] in Dix's paintings (e.g., *Cardplaying War-Cripples*, 1920; *War Cripples*, 1920), pointed criticism of the current situation in Germany in Grosz's paintings, and the rise of German expressionist cinema (*The Golem*, 1915 and *The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari*, 1920). Among the specific expressionistic characteristics of the novel Syvachenko identifies "contradictions between spiritual culture, morality, and the technical capabilities of humankind," the grotesque and expressionistic manner, apocalyptic vision, movements and gestures without deep psychological descriptions, simultaneity of actions, deformation, the eradication of boundaries between real and fantastic events, and the transformation of images into symbols. The critic's analysis is, however, declarative, and she barely connects her observations with references to the text of *Soniachna mashyna*.

To demonstrate the presence of Expressionism in the novel I will focus on one of its aspects—the hyperbolized characterization of characters, including the grotesque. As a term, grotesque is applied to a "decorative art in sculpture, painting and architecture, characterized by fantastic representations of human and animal forms often combined into formal distortions of the natural to the point of absurdity, ugliness, or caricature" (Holman and Harmon, 219). It has the same function in literature, often indicating interest in the irrational, domination of one feature over another, the merger of comic and tragic elements, partaking of satire but carrying the expression of deep social and moral preoccupation. Vynnychenko's critics (Zerov, Syvachenko, Koznarsky) noted the grotesque character of *Soniachna mashyna.* It is especially evident in the depiction of characters. Large bodies, their awkwardness and repugnant appearance, often implying parallels with animals, were a typical product of expressionist artists in their satires on capitalists. The paintings of the German artist George Grosz come to mind. In his *Die Besitzkröten* [The Toads of Possession] he presents three industrialists juxtaposed against the poor and downtrodden. In addition to their obese figures, they exhibit other signs of "true" capitalists—diamond tiepins, pince-nez, and cigars (Whitford, 129). In this sense, Mertens's image in *Soniachna mashyna* is the most grotesque; it is almost a caricature. He does not resemble a real man; he is rather an embodiment of a capitalist: he has a "bull's neck" [бичача шия], a "stumpy, thick hand" [куца товста рука] "fleshy ear" [м'ясисте вухо], "meaty lips" [м'ясисті губи], "compact body" [туго збите тіло], "round knees" [круглі коліна], "stubby, hard hands with thick fingers" [цупкі руки з товстими пальцями]; his face is "flabby with square sweaty jaws" [обвисле, з квадратовими пітними щелепами]; he often sweats and screws up his eyes from the light (8-10). Throughout the novel Mertens's sweating is a recurrent image that emphasizes his heavy body:

> А над верхньою губою дрібно-дрібно, як вогкість на стіні, мокріє піт. Мокріє він і на бурому чолі, випнутому згори, ввігнутому посередині й випнутому знову на бровах, подібному до сідла. Розхристані майже до живота за останньою модою (що пішла трохи не від самого Мертенса) грубі й червоні груди теж мокро блищать од поту (9).

> And above his upper lip sweat gathers wetly, with tiny pearls resembling dampness on a wall. He is also sweating on his brown forehead, which protrudes at the top; it is concave in the middle and bulges on his brows, like a saddle. His rough, reddened chest, exposed almost to his belly according to the latest fashion (which came from Mertens's himself), also gleams with sweat.

In the portrayal of Mertens's face Vynnychenko also uses the epithet "rusty" [іржавий] to show the weakness and decay of the capitalist order. Logically, it contradicts his characterization of Mertens as a man with a fleshy body. But on the other hand, it corresponds well to the representation of the grotesque. Among animals he resembles a "thick-skinned behemoth," which is what the Inaracs, Tile and Max, call him (209).

Grotesque forms are characteristic of the portrayal of Winter, Mertens's secretary. He is a person with the features of a greyhound:

> Вінтер, секретар Мертенса, високий, тонкий, з підібганим животом і довгою фізіономією хорта, безшумно й легко то входить, то виходить із дверей кабінету, подібних до царських церковних врат. І князь по лініях його тіла, по рухах рук і нахилу собачої голови може судити про ступінь значності того, до кого Вінтер підходить. Це надзвичайно чулий, удосконалений апарат, що зазначує в собі щонайменшу різницю в еманації істот у фотелях. Він, як червак, здасться, має здатність то робитись іще довшим і тоншим од поштивості, то зщулюватись, утягати самого себе в себе, ставати товстішим і меншим од погорди (7).

> Winter, Mertens's secretary, tall and thin with a drawn-in abdomen and the elongated physiognomy of a greyhound, steps quietly and softly back and forth through the office doors, which resemble the Royal Doors in a church. And looking at the contours of his body, the gestures of his hands and the way the dog-like head is inclined, the duke can judge the degree of importance of the person whom Winter is approaching. This is an extraordinarily sensitive and sophisticated machine that records the tiniest difference in the emanations of the figures sitting in the armchairs. Like a worm, he seems to have the capacity either to become even taller and thinner out of politeness or to shrink and draw into himself and become stouter and smaller out of arrogance.

Certainly, Vynnychenko's descriptions of those whom he wanted to criticize more sharply—the capitalists—are imbued with more grotesqueness. This concentration of negative tones in one person can be explained by the objective of political satire. However, ordinary people in *Soniachna mashyna* also possess some expressionist characteristics. The Nadel family resembles the images of poor workers from Grosz's painting mentioned above. Gustav Nadel, a cripple with one hand (images of cripples were typical in paintings by Dix and other expressionist artists), works hard at a factory to earn a living for his impoverished family. His daughters are

> ...вічно голодні, вічно пороззявлювані дзюби, та й більше нічого. Знай, набивай їх зранку до вечора, щоб не пищали... на столі вечеря, не пишна, проста, пролетарська, а проте таки людська вечеря... А стара пані Надель байдуже плете собі панчохи біля вікна. Рот їй трошки перекривлений на правий бік; щоки одвисли двома жовто-смуглявими пом'ятими торбинками; припухлі синюваті повіки важко й безпричасно налягли на банькаті чорні очі... В хаті брудно, неохайно, безладно (73-75).

> ...constantly hungry, always with open beaks [a comparison with an animal again], and nothing more. You have to stuff them from morning till night so that they don't squawk... supper is on the table, it is not a sumptuous one but simple proletarian, human fare... Old Mrs. Nadel is knitting stockings indifferently near the window. Her

> mouth is skew a bit to the right; her cheeks hang down in two small yellow-brown crumpled bags; her swollen bluish eyelids lie heavily on her bugged out black eyes… The house is dirty, untidy, and disorderly.

Vynnychenko exaggerates his portrayal of two main female characters—princess Elisa and Gertrude, both of whom have animal features. Elisa's aristocratism is associated with the image of a swan: "Princess Elisa takes smooth and dignified steps around the castle courtyard, holding her little head severely and easily on her large and sumptuous body swathed tightly in old-fashioned cloth—a head of a small, golden snake on a black swan's body" [Подвір'ям замку принцеса Еліза проходить плавкою. поважною ходою, строго й легко несучи маленьку голівку на великому пишному тілі, щільно обтягненому на крутих клубах старомодною амазонкою,—голівка золотистої гадючки на тілі чорного лебедя] (14). Her similarity to an animal is so recurrent throughout the text that it seems the author wants readers to see a kind of a fairy-tale creature—half-woman and half-swan. Although Elisa is a representative of the aristocracy, she is depicted as a romantic person: "At the exit from the park the sky unfolds its broad, dashing blue embraces. The princess lifts her golden red head: the sky is so beautiful, clean, transparent, and soft that it seems as though one can fly in it without machines" [При виході з парку небо розгортає широченні розгонисті блакитні обійми. Принцеса злегка підводить золото-червону голову: гарне небо, чисте, прозоре й таке легке, що, здається, можна літати в ньому без ніяких апаратів] (13-14). Ultimately by the end of the novel she will cut off with the old order and participate actively in the creation of a new communist society.

On the other hand, Gertrude, a poor girl who will become an active supporter of the solar machine, resembles a monster, an image that is also consistently sustained throughout the text: "This Monstrosity does not even try to hold herself up straight in the presence of the distinguished guest: she hunches her back, shakes her hair cut in a boyish style, and indifferently screws up her bulging eyes, which are the colour of old, golden bronze" [Це Страховище не силкується навіть трошки рівніше триматися у присутності високої гості: горбиться, по-хлопчачому стріпує стриженою головою, байдуже мружить пукаті очі кольору старої золотистої бронзи] (30). Her ugly outward appearance is used to emphasize her strong inner world and that she can be happy as a result of her inner harmony.

A similar contrast—ugly external appearance and rich inner world—also characterizes the inventor Rudolf Schtor. Elisa's love for this limping cripple, actually follows the model of the Ugly Duckling tale.

Reflecting interest in the European avant-garde in cinema and combining various artistic devices, *Soniachna mashyna* utilizes elements of cinematic technique.[43] This includes a film script technique, quick montage and sharp turns of events, and the depiction of movements. For instance, the narrative of the novel consists of short episodes with fast changes of scenes and locations, which remind us of a film running on a screen. Marked with three asterisks, each volume has the following number of episodes: 1—45, 2—40, and 3—40.

The novel also bears a resemblance to a film script. "It must indicate clearly," J. Michael Straczynski says, "who is going to say what, when they are going to move, where they are going to go, how they are going to get there, how each shot is to be approached, and so forth" (30). In this sense, the narrative of the novel contains such detailed descriptions that are reminiscent of film script instructions: "Princess Elisa is sitting erectly, frowning severely. The aging earl, his head bent, is looking at the floor. Mrs. Schtor, with hope and alarm, closely follows her son's every movement with her large, silent eyes" [Принцеса Еліза сидить рівно, строго зібравши брови. Старий граф, нахиливши голову, дивиться в підлогу. Пані Штор із надією й тривогою пильно слідкує за кожним рухом сина мовчазними великими очима] (227); "Max's glance falls on a toothbrush. He grabs it furiously and searches for somewhere to hide it and puts it angrily into the table drawer. Then he sits down and with a decisive movement pulls the manuscript toward himself" [Погляд Макса падає на зубну щіточку. Він люто хапає її, шукає, куди б сховати, й роздратовано кладе в шухляду столу. Потім сідає й рішуче підсуває до себе рукопис] (157).

---

[43] The blending of different artistic modes was characteristic of the Ukrainian avant-garde. Visual experiments were part of the agenda of the Futurists, who created a polyartistic atmosphere. The writers (Mykhail' Semenko, Geo Shkurupii, Andrii Chuzhyi, Oleksa Slisarenko), painters (Vasyl' Semenko, Pavlo Kovzhun, Volodymyr Tatlin, Anatol' Petryts'kyi, Vadym Meller), theatre directors (Les' Kurbas, Marko Tereshchenko), and photographers (Dan Sotnyk) collaborated closely in the field. Many writers were involved in film production as editors or scriptwriters (Mykola Bazhan, Semenko, Shkurupii, Dmytro Buz'ko, Leonid Skrypnyk, Oleksii Poltorats'kyi) (see Ilnytzkyj 1997, 323-34).

Movements, having visual representation, are an intrinsic feature of film. In a literary work this can be compensated by their detailed description. It embraces large visual panoramas that often have a global perspective, as well as small details as though seen through a film camera. This depiction of movements is well rendered in the scene of the invasion by the Eastern army's aviation:

> Із-за обрію в небо сунеться чорна хмара; вона одного темного кольору, з правильно обточеними лініями. Це велетенський широкий конус шпилем уперед. Конус сунеться з помітною швидкістю, закриваючи собою хмарини, займаючи собою щораз більшу частину неба, як хобот страховища, рухається то вправо, то вліво. І що ближче, то передня його частина стає ясніша від задньої, рідша, ряба. Вже видко, що страховище немовби вкрите лускою, що кожна лусочка є окреме довгасте тіло (552).

> A black cloud is advancing into the sky from beyond the horizon; it is dark with evenly shaped contours. It is a huge, wide cone pointing forward. The cone moves with noticeable speed, blocking the clouds and increasingly occupying a greater part of the sky, like the proboscis of a monster, moving from right to left. The closer it gets, the clearer its front part becomes from the rear one; it becomes thinner and spotted. You can see that the monster seems to be covered with scales and that each scale is a separate long body.

or in the scene of the plane crash:

> Раптом залізне тіло машини струшується несподіваним корчем. Доктор Рудольф машинально хапається за поруччя сидіння, а тим часом рука майстра Кіна швидко перестрибує трошки вгору на блискуче державльце і сильно крутить його вбік. Але залізне крилате тіло знову здригається, потім починає стрибати направо, наліво, скажено корчево прочається, рветься, лютує. Спина майстра Кіна неспокійно, розгублено совається то в один бік, то в другий... апарат прожогом, нахилившись носом униз, летить до землі (415).

> Suddenly the steel body of the machine is shaken by an unexpected spasm. Dr. Rudolf automatically grabs the seat's railing; meanwhile the hand of the master workman Kin quickly moves slightly upward to a small shiny handle and turns it sharply aside. But the steel winged body shudders again; then begins jumping to the right and to the left, savagely and spasmodically resisting, bucking, and raging. Kin's spine moves agitatedly and confusedly to one side and the other… the machine, with its bow bent downward, flies to the ground.

Vynnychenko also used a literary technique germane to an adventure and detective story with an intensely dramatized plot that makes the narrative more dynamic and pleasantly affects the nerves (Khrystiuk 1929). Holman and Harman define the genre of adventure story as "a story in which action—always exterior, usually physical, and frequently violent—is the predominant material, stressed above characterization, motivation, or theme" (5). The adventure story was very popular in the West owing to works by Jules Verne, Arthur Conan Doyle, and others. The detective story, as a form of adventure based on the commission and detection of crime, came into prominence in the 1880s, with Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories. The adventure story tradition began penetrating Ukrainian literature in the 1920s and was represented in the works of Sandro Kasianiuk, Ivan Senchenko, Iurii Smolych, Geo Shkurupii, and others.[44] Ilnytzkyj points out that the Ukrainian avant-garde, particularly Futurism, turned to such works to undermine traditional realistic prose (1997, 294-95).

In *Soniachna mashyna* the adventure narrative is sustained through episodes that depict explosions, a man-hunt, car chases, escapes, terrorism, military invasion, etc. The Inaracist Max, for instance, escapes from the police by running and jumping onto roofs of high buildings. Here is how Vynnychenko portrays an assassination attempt on Mertens by the Inaracists Tile and Max:

> Раптом над головою із страшенним тріском і гуркотом розкочується вибух. Бомба? Грім?
>
> Авто видирається на чисту дорогу й несеться вулицею. Пан президент, відкинувшись назад, весело витирає лице, шию, руки й важко дихає. Ну, що? Нам'яв вуха? Що? Ні? Де ж ті паршивці з своїми бомбами? Га?
>
> Видушуючи колесами, як із сикавок, струї води, до театру підлітає друге авто. В ньому сидять Тіле й Макс. Дощ заліплює віконця, але й крізь заплакане скло видно, що юрба, як після закінченого свята, живо, піднято колихаючись уливається знову в театр.
>
> Тіле люто зціплює зуби. Пізно—втік товстошкурий бегемот (209).

> Suddenly an explosion crashes over the crowd with a terrible noise and rumble. Was it a bomb? Thunder?

---

[44] Apparently, adventure writings can be confirmed by the response of literary critique. One of them, for instance, was an article by Hryhorii Maifet, "Analiza detektyvnoi noveli" [Analysis of a Detective Story] which analyzes a story by Shkurupii, entitled *Provokator* [Agent Provocateur] (*Zhyttia i revoliutsiia*. 1 (1928): 66-72).

> The car careens onto the empty road and rushes along the street. The president, leaning backward, merrily wipes his face, neck, and hands and breathes heavily. So what? Did he yank their ears? What? No? Where are those bastards with their bombs?
>
> Splashing jets of water with its wheels, another car rushes up to the theatre. Tile and Max are inside. The rain plasters the car windows, but even through the tear-stained glass you can see that the swaying crowd, like after a celebration, is pouring excitedly into the theatre again.
>
> Tile's lips are clamped tightly in a furious grimace. It's too late—the thick-skinned behemoth has escaped.

The detective element in the novel is connected with the "Siegfried's crown," which also symbolizes the possibility of restoring monarchic rule in Germany. The importance of this symbol is emphasized by princess Elisa Ellenberg, who stipulates that she will marry Mertens only after he finds the crown that was stolen by an unidentified person. It turns out that Rudolf Schtor took the crown, which he needed to carry out experiments for the creation of the solar machine. After he returns the family relic to its owners, the adventure plot abates. To some extent the author used the adventure device to instill his ideological tenets in his readers.[45]

Despite some criticism of Vynnychenko's stylistic devices (which I shall address below), they were elements that may have helped to counter its awkwardness as an ideological construct, a product of the different "horizon of expectation" that existed between Ukraine and Europe.

---

[45] This device is used in Chernyshevskii's novel *Chto delat'?* [What Is to Be Done?] (1863). The novel was an important work in Russian literature, which alluded, in the form of a dream, to a future communist society and perfect people.

3.5.2. Utopia as a Manifestation of Uprootedness

The issue of how geographical displacement influences utopian writing has not been the focus of much attention in the vast field of utopian studies. However, the relationship between utopia and social reality has been the subject of many works (Bloch, Mannheim, Ricoeur, and Plattel). This gives us a theoretical clue of how to approach this type of analysis. Some aspects of how *Soniachna mashyna* is related to Vynnychenko's displacement were examined in works by Onyshkevych (the influence of the socio-political situation in Germany, 1972) and Syvachenko (cultural and artistic influence, 1998). Pohorilyi generalized that geographical displacement as a social and cultural phenomenon contributed to the new direction in Vynnychenko's writings, but he did not focus on the mechanism of this change (cf. preface). Here I would like to examine how utopia might be specifically connected with displacement.

Why write a utopia at this time? Was it only Vynnychenko's ideological predisposition? I will argue that his social, cultural, and psychological displacement, which I have addressed above, was a very important factor in his turn to this new endeavour, which marked a cardinal shift in his literary career. Utopia (Greek *u-topia*—nowhere, not here) as a genre can be seen as very appropriate for a displaced writer. Since ancient times, it appears as a result of dissatisfaction with life in the present, a response to a state of crisis in society, and as a possibility to transcend the given reality. "We dream of utopia because we are unhappy," Milton Ehre says. Thus, utopia, as Karl Mannheim argues, has a wish-fulfillment function:

> When the imagination finds no satisfaction in existing reality, it seeks refuge in wishfully constructed places and periods. Myths, fairy tales, other-worldly promises of

> religion, humanistic fantasies, travel romances, have been continually changing expressions of that which was lacking in actual life (205).

At the time that Vynnychenko was working on *Soniachna mashyna*, he found himself in a state of extreme uprootedness and ambiguity (see section 3.3.). Utopia, as Vynnychenko's case demonstrates, helped channel his escapist tendencies and smooth his anxiety and uncertainty, helping him to overcome the absurdity of his present by projecting a better future. Vynnychenko revealed as much when he was finishing his work on the novel (7 January 1924):

> Взагалі ми живемо в атмосфері непевности, невизначености в усьому. В політиці: непевність, невідомість кінця еміграції, падіння большевиків, відродження української державности. Політична робота за кордоном. Залежить від подорожі до Праги,—непевність. Подорож до Праги? Непевність, чи матиму візу,—щось ніякої чутки.
>
> Справа з Кіпенгойєром, постановка моїх п'єс. Непевно, ще вовтузимося з договором.—Українфільм? Непевно, невідомо, чи буде, чи не буде... Словом, нічого ні в чому немає певного, твердого, надійного... І в цій обстановці писати радісний, впевнений, "утверждающий" кінець "СМ"! (*Shchodennyk* 2: 276)

> In general, we live in an atmosphere of uncertainty and vagueness about everything. In politics: uncertainty about the end of emigration, the fall of the Bolsheviks, and revival of Ukrainian statehood. Political work abroad. It depends on my visit to Prague—uncertainty. A visit to Prague? It's not certain that I will obtain a visa—there has been no response yet.
>
> The affair with Kiepenheuer and the staging of my plays. It's uncertain because we are still dealing with the contract. Ukrainfilm? It's uncertain and unknown if it will work out or not… In a word, there is nothing certain, stable, and reliable about everything… And in these circumstances, how can I create an ending for *Soniachna mashyna*, which is joyous, positive, and affirmative!

In Chapter One I mention a specific feature of displaced writing that tends to be alienated from the present and preoccupied either with the past or the future. Utopian thinking is an explicit manifestation of this tendency to focus on the future. "The essence of the utopia," observes Plattel, "consists in the liberating impetus to transcend the limitations of human existence in the direction of a better future" (44). We clearly saw Vynnychenko's crisis with regard to the elaboration of new themes right after 1920. Although they were well written, *Zakon*, *Pisnia Izrailia*, and *Namysto*, were a reiteration of old themes and represented a return to the past (the one exception to this pattern was *Na toi bik*). Now Vynnychenko had suddenly moved to the projection of the future in *Soniachna mashyna*. Certainly, this work may be considered an outcome of social utopian thinking (Lysiak-Rudnytsky, Koznarsky), but I suggest that the social and psychological condition of displacement is also rendered in this literary form. Home is not only the past but also the future, as Gurr puts it (121). While residing in an anxiety provoking hostland, the writer is able to find peaceful home in the future.

To develop this assumption, I will further dwell on the concept of nostalgia, which was raised earlier. Interestingly, Vynnychenko worked on *Soniachna mashyna* simultaneously with his children's stories, which elaborated a nostalgia for the past. Can *Soniachna mashyna* too be related to a nostalgia for the past? The theory of nostalgia proposes that there is a direct relationship between nostalgia for the past and nostalgia for the future. M. Mike Nawas and Jerome J. Platt, in their article "A Future Oriented Theory of Nostalgia," define the latter as a mildly neurotic state that results from an unsuccessful adaptation to one's present surroundings and concern over the future. The concept of home both in physical and spiritual terms is at the core of people's nostalgia. Home gives meaning to life and a sense of belonging. Home, as Frederick Buechner puts it, is a place of origin and an ultimate destination, to which a man inevitably comes and where s/he can "find something like the wholeness and comfort of home within ourselves" (2). In mythological terms, home takes the form of paradise, which has an archetypical basis. "The longing for freedom from conflict, suffering and deprivation is an eternal human dream of great emotional power. It is the dream of total happiness, embodied in almost all cultures in the myth of Paradise," writes Mario Jacoby (vii). In terms of utopia, this is a future ideal and perfect society, for which one longs.

In Vynnychenko's novel the vision of the future is depicted in bright and vivid colours and images. The metaphor of the sun is dominant; it is present in the title of the work (it is also present in the title of Krat's utopia, *Koly ziishlo sontse*), as well as in its motto: "I dedicate this work to my sunny Ukraine" [Присвячую моїй сонячній Україні]. People's expectations of a new life are paralleled by the expectation of the sunrise: "The crowd of people is impatient and they raise their heads to the sky—the sun will rise quickly… [Gertrude]—Well, Elisa! Well, my wonderful, my beautiful!... Look, what a celebration! The sun will rise right now" [Юрба нетерпеливиться й задирає голови до неба—хутко зійде сонце... [Труда]—Ну, Елізо! Ну, чудесна, прекрасна!... Ви ж дивіться, яке свято! Зараз сонце зійде] (609).

Gertrude's vision of the future society fits the traditional pattern of a society with material abundance, comfort, and a sense of people's universal brotherhood, resembling a paradise:

> Ах, Елізо, як може бути гарно, прекрасно жити. Ви уявіть собі, що коли ми будемо працювати всього по дві обов'язкові години на день—усього по дві години!—то ми всі, всі без найменшого вийнятку, будемо мати, перше—прекрасні помешкання, друге—чудові, зручні, розкішні меблі, третє—в кожній кімнаті буде кіно, екран, телефон, кіногазета, радіофотографії з усього світу, четверте—всі ми будемо носити найтонше полотно, шовки, найкращі матерії,

> п'яте—в кожного буде авто, аеро всяких систем, шосте—ми зможемо літати з одного кінця землі на другий, ніяких кордонів… (529)
>
> Ah, Elisa, how wonderful it can be, how wonderful to live. Just imagine that when we will be working only for two obligatory hours per day—only for two hours!—then we shall all, without exception, have, firstly—wonderful residences, secondly—nice, comfortable, and luxurious furniture, thirdly—there will be a film, screen, telephone, film-newspaper, radio-pictures in every room from all over the world, fourthly—we'll all wear the most delicate cloth, silk, and the best fabric, fifthly—everybody will have a car and aero[46] of various systems, and sixthly—we'll be able to fly from one end of the planet to another one, and there won't be any borders…

This bright future is also emphasized by the idea of free love relationships. Gertrude articulates Vynnychenko's belief in it:

> А кохання? Елізо! Ви ж подумайте: ніяких шлюбів, контрактів, ніякого купування й продавання себе за гроші, за "становище в світі", за титули. Люби, кохай, кого хочеш, як хочеш, скільки хочеш. І тільки того, хто тобі любий, хто підходить до тебе, кого ти від усього тіла й душі своєї хочеш назвати своїм мужем... Будуть діти? О, будь ласка! Можна мати їх скільки хочеш без страху за їхню долю. І ніяких "незаконних" дітей! Всі—законні, всі—від усіх мужів, яких я хочу мати хоч тисячу! (531)
>
> And what about love? Elisa! Just think: no marriages, no contracts, no purchasing and selling oneself for money, for "status in the world" and for titles. You can like and love whomever you want, how you want, and however long you want. And only the one who is beloved by you, who suits you, and whom you want to call your man with your whole body and soul... And what if there are children? Go right ahead! You can have as many as you want and not be afraid for their fate. And there will be no "illegitimate" children! All of them will be legitimate, every single one—from all men whom I may desire, even if I want a thousand!

Vynnychenko's preoccupation with the future in this novel is unmistakable in comparison with his earlier works. In *Soniachna mashyna* his revolutionary heroes constantly reflect on how beautiful the future will be, while in his works from the first displacement (e.g., "Taina," *Chesnist' z soboiu*, *Rivnovaha*) his revolutionaries do not go further than focusing on their current revolutionary activity.

---

[46] Vynnychenko means "airplanes."

In contrast, the present world of the novel is depicted as being unbearable. Mostly this is implied by the existence of the hyper-capitalist society and the centralization of power whereby a handful of people decide the fate of the majority. The terrorist organization Inarac emerges as the "inevitable result and logical consequence of the social and political regime that has been established by the current hosts of the country; it is a natural response to despotism and the social terror of the kings of the stock exchange" (42). This is a society of unhappy people. But this unhappiness is not only the result of capitalist injustice but also of moral imperfection. Mertens is actually as unhappy as the poor proletarian Gustav Nadel. Rudolf articulates this position:

> [Я] зробив масу цікавих відкриттів. Наприклад: щастя—така надзвичайно рідка, ненормальна річ у людей, що того, кому вона попадається, вважають за ненормального. Правда? ... Щастя—то ненормальність, оп'яніння або божевілля... І тільки сьогодні, мої панове, зрозумів як слід, через що люди п'ють: вони хоч трошки хочуть наблизити себе до щастя. Але на щастя п'яного дивляться з посмішкою, бо знають, що його "ненормальність" мине, але на щастя "божевільного"—серйозно, з острахом, із жалем, з ніяковим усміхом. От, наприклад, як ви всі на мене. Правда? (225)

> [I] made many interesting discoveries. For instance: happiness is such an extremely rare and odd thing in people that the person who manages to obtain it is considered abnormal. Right? ... Happiness is abnormality, intoxication, or madness… And just today, my dear, I completely understood why people drink alcohol: they want to get closer to happiness, if only a little bit. But people smilingly observe a drunk's happiness because they know his "abnormality" will pass, but the happiness of a "madman" they regard seriously, with fear, pity, and an embarrassing smile. For instance, the way you look at me. Right?

Soniachna mashyna may thus be easily placed within this paradigm of nostalgia and explained by Vynnychenko's uprootedness, his alienatation from the present, and his search for happiness and home in the future. His children's stories, on the other hand, correspond to the other pole of nostalgia, which depends on the past. But whereas nostalgia for the past is based on an individual experience, nostalgia for the future can rely only on social expectations and beliefs. This amplitude of the concept shows not only the restorative power of nostalgia but also its strong predisposition to change the current world—which is an echo of the author's political and ideological preoccupation.

Lewis Mumford classifies two forms of utopia: escape and reconstruction. The utopia of escape "seeks an immediate release from the difficulties or frustrations of our lot... [It] leaves the external world the way it is... [in which] we build impossible castles in the air." A utopia of reconstruction "attempts to provide a condition for our release in the future... [it] seeks to change [the world] so that one may have intercourse with it in one's own terms... [and] we consult a surveyor and an architect and a mason and proceed to build a house which meets our essential needs" (15). Plattel also admits that utopian escape from reality reflects "a realm of alienation," which in extreme cases takes on degenerated forms:

> These "utopias of escape" become a danger and assume a totalitarian form when they are mistaken for pictures of a real world... It no longer plays with the possibility that things could be different but degenerates into an authoritarian wishful dreaming of social myths or, if it is less powerful, into a dogmatic hammering on ideological positions...
>
> A healthy utopia offers a new perspective on man and society, but its content must be given further shape by means of experience inspired by the utopia (81).

Within this framework, Vynnychenko's children's stories can be viewed, roughly speaking, as his escape, albeit not a utopian one, from the present into the past; whereas his utopian novel—as a utopia of reconstruction—projects his expectation into the future. But we must also bear in mind that the impetus for reconstruction may be stimulated by a wish to overcome one's reality or, so to speak, to escape from it. In his critique of Vynnychenko's writings, Kaczurowskyj indicates elements of escapism in *Soniachna mashyna*, which smoothly correlate with the writer's own strong escapist tendency during this period (2002, 163). It looks as though borders of escape and reconstruction may actually blur and overlap, and they also share the same source—dissatisfaction with the present condition. Utopian writers often find themselves in a kind of displacement—inner, when they remain in the homeland, or outer, when they are forced to move to the hostland. Thus, being out of the homeland is not a necessary prerequisite to creating a utopia, but it may influence considerably a writer to take this path. Much depends on personality and social or historical conditions.

When the present is intolerable, utopia constitutes a suitable foundation for transcending the given reality, and at the same time provides a sense of rootedness. "Whatever might be said or thought of utopian speculation," says Peyton E. Richter, "a study of its historical development and various forms will reveal it to be something which springs from deep within the human psyche, giving expression to the human need for rootedness as well as transcendence" (4-5). Vynnychenko's attempts to transcend existing capitalist reality resemble the notion of religious exile for persons who consider their true home beyond the earth. The religious aspect may sound paradoxical in relation to Vynnychenko, as he was persistently opposed to any form of religion. But the idea of socialism, besides its pragmatic aspect, also had religious overtones, proclaiming an ideal and perfect society somewhere in the future. Among proponents of this idea was Anatolii Lunacharskii, whom Vynnychenko met in Europe (Capri and Paris). In Lunacharskii's two-volume work, *Religiia i sotsializm* [Religion and Socialism] (St. Petersburg, 1908-11), he defined socialism as the last religion in the world. In his opinion, Marx's philosophy is a religious philosophy, and socialism, as a form of religion, could be of enormous strength. What is similar in this case between religion and socialism is the rejection of the present as temporary and defective, and hope and faith in the coming future. In Ernst Bloch's opinion, the utopian function is the "principle of hope." Vynnychenko's reflection on hope at the beginning of the novel conveys this religious rhetoric: "Hope is a miraculous, frightening thing. It is that which leads the convicted to death on the scaffold, not fear or submission… That is what reanimates corpses, puts cripples back on their feet, makes the blind see; fills the withered, lifeless, and inert with its juices and energy" [Чудодійна, страшна річ—надія. То вона, а не страх, не покірність веде засуджених на смерть на ешафот... І вона оживлює мертвяків, ставить на ноги калік, робить видющими незрячих; висхлих, безживних, інертних сповнює соками й енергією] (7-8).

Among the various features of utopia Paul Ricoeur distinguishes the concept of 'nowhere,' a specific exterritoriality of utopia that allows, in an imaginary way, the construction of an alternative perspective of a human society. Certainly, the "nowhereness" of utopia appeals to a displaced person's constant dilemma of geographical location, which triggers a number of social, cultural, and psychological questions concerning the adjustment and negotiation between the homeland and hostland.

At first glance, it may seem that Vynnychenko does not follow this principle and sets his narrative in a concrete place—Berlin (symbolizing Germany). He uses, for instance, specific German names: Hans, Rudolf, Max, Frieda, Friedrick, Elisa, Georg, Adolph, Gertrude, etc. (Gertrude is truncated to Truda, which sounds very symbolic both in Ukrainian and Russian—"Labour"). Actually, this was the writer's "principle of locale" governing the use of the hostland in his works. He applied it during his first exile in France (i.e., "Taina," *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, *Rivnovaha* and "Olaf Setefenzon") and Italy ("Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku"), and he would also utilize this principle later, after his second move to France (*Velykyi sekret*, *Poklady zolota*, *Vichnyi imperatyv*, *Leprozorii* and *Nova zapovid'* are all set in France).

Zales'ka-Onyshkevych acknowledges that the general social and political situation in Germany had an impact on the writing of *Soniachna mashyna* (1972, 61). Vynnychenko shows the state of chaos and uncertainty and the opposition of different political forces in Germany in the 1920s. The narrator in the utopia observes that "Contemporary Germany is an iron and concrete house full of insane, morally weak, predatory, ruthless, and terribly unfortunate beings" [[С]учасна Німеччина—це залізобетоновий дім божевільних, моральноголених, хижожорстоких і моторошнонещасних істот] (28) (cf. the writer's diary notes about the current situation in Germany). The use of the locale was Vynnychenko's strategy to enter the new society and its market. The writer admitted that the German setting of the novel, albeit fictitious, was designed to attract local readers. It is particularly evident when he complains later in France that the German locale might create a problem for the novel's publication in France: "…[T]he subject matter is [taken] from the life of Germany. So, the question arises whether it is doomed to failure if is published now in France" [...[З]міст роману [взято] з життя Німеччини. Отже, виникає питання, чи не засуджується річ на провал, якщо тепер видасться у Франції] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 522, 28 February 1925).

However, in many respects the German setting is vague, not concrete, and quite symbolic, revealing the utopian characteristic of "nowhereness" or, I would say, "everywhereness." This type of setting manifested itself also in Vynnychenko's works that were written during his first displacement (e.g., "Taiemna pryhoda" and "Chudnyi epizod" or the conventionalized setting of his plays). Many critics rejected the German setting as an authentic place. For Richyts'kyi, for instance, the setting is Berlin, Germany, and the whole world at the same time (68). Although the events take place mainly in Berlin, Bilets'kyi notes that the city often has the flavour of a countryside and does not impress as a new metropolis (121). Zerov observes that Vynnychenko, while depicting Germany, did not loose touch with Ukrainian realities of the time. For instance, the German characters resemble Ukrainians who, after obtaining the solar machine, "give themselves over either to a bee-keeper's tranquility or Zaporozhian drinking sprees" instead of German-like order (Zerov, 454). In this sense, as Koznarskyi points out, it would be difficult for Europeans to recognize "themselves" in the novel (77). I agree with the critics that many of Vynnychenko's foreign characters (not only in *Soniachna mashyna* but also in his works from his first displacement) seem to lack authenticity and appear artificial in their new space. This is due to the fact that Vynnychenko did not know the local society sufficiently to portray it properly, although he had adjusted to some extent to the general situation.

In reflecting the general situation in Germany, Vynnychenko did not aspire to convey it with documentary authenticity. The German locale was important for the writer as a symbolic place that encapsulated his vision of a hyper-capitalist society, its decline, and the advent of a communism. This symbolic representation can be also found in the portrayal of Berlin as a city built of concrete and metal and populated by millions of people. Here is how Vynnychenko describes the stock exchange building, the centre of industrial life in the country:

> Ось воно, серце Німеччини. Величезна темно-сіра буддійська пагода, шершава, важка, як велетенська черепаха, що міцно вперлася на лапи й роззявила пащу-двері. Круг неї, як стривожені комахи, шамотяться авто, приїжджають, від'їжджають, трусяться, пихкають, нетерпеливляться. Люди пачками вистрибують із них і прожогом несуться в роззявлену пащу черепахи. Другі вилітать із неї, махають руками, капелюхами, стрибають в екіпажі, вибиваються з юрби й женуть кудись стрімголов. Газетчики люто кричать, вимахують окремими додатками газет, кидаються під ноги. Крик, гуркіт, рявкіт, свист, дзвін (189-90).

> Here it is: the heart of Germany. A huge, dark-grey Buddhist pagoda, rough and heavy like a gigantic tortoise solidly resting on its paws, opening its maw, like a door. Around it, like alarmed insects, cars are fussing, arriving, departing, trembling, puffing, and becoming impatient. Packs of people are leaping from them and rushing into the open maw of the tortoise. Other people are running out of it, waving their hands and hats, jumping into taxis, pushing through the crowd and hurrying somewhere headlong. Newspaper vendors are shouting angrily, waving supplements from their newspapers, and getting underfoot. Cries, deafening noise, screeching, whistles, and bells.

To a large extent, the utopian community is totalitarian in nature (Koznarsky, 12-13). It implies the same social and moral principles for all its members. Displacement at a certain point may lead a writer to assume a stance of universality, to embrace the whole world (or lead to total seclusion from the world, as another extreme). In this sense, the totalitarian nature of utopia corresponds to universality—a presence here, there, and everywhere, an attitude that Vynnychenko repeatedly expresses in his diary. The homeland remains valuable as a part of that world. It is more natural for the writer to ally himself not with a concrete country, to which he lacks sufficient loyalty, but with the whole planet:

> Ідея активного, повсякчасного, щоденного творення свого щастя, гармонізація себе з біологічним і соціяльним, а так само гармонізація себе самого сповнює якимсь особливим затишком усю істоту, почуванням зріднености з тим клаптем землі, на якому живеш. Нема чуття чужости, закинутости, гнітючої туги за рідним краєм, сиротливости й самотности. Все—близьке, все є рідна плянета, люба Земля наша, скрізь можна і треба діяти й творити. І любов до рідного краю зовсім не вимагає чужости до інших частин Матері-Землі. Я—громадянин Плянети і плюю на тимчасові поділи людей на держави (*Shchodennyk*, 7 December 1926).
>
> The idea of an active, constant and daily creation of one's happiness, one's harmonization with the biological and social, as well as one's own harmonization fills one's being with special comfort and feeling of kinship with that part of the planet where you live. There is no feeling of alienation, abandonment, depressing longing for the homeland, solitude, and loneliness. Everything is near and dear, everything is the home planet, our beautiful Earth; everywhere one can and must act and create. And love for the homeland doesn't necessarily require alienation from other parts of Mother Earth. I am a citizen of the Planet and I spit on the temporary division of peoples into states.

Vynnychenko's allusions to a state without borders in the novel (529) are essential in this respect and can be viewed as a response to the new quality of his second displacement. Whereas in his previous works his protagonists view state borders as a kind of protection to sustain their identity (e.g., in *Rivnovaha*, to remain true revolutionaries, they have to return home instead of stagnating in a foreign country, France), in *Soniachna mashyna* state borders appear to be a relic of the hyper-capitalist epoch, and genuine happiness is seen through people's connection to the whole world.

Soniachna mashyna became a landmark for Vynnychenko the writer, who was moving from a local Ukrainian to a universal stance, although, as we shall see below, this shift did not necessarily guarantee him a more favourable international reception. *Soniachna mashyna* was his first work without Ukrainian characters. Essentially it was designed for a broad international audience and addressed the vital issues of the future development of human civilization. Working on the novel, Vynnychenko noted in the diary: "I must explicitly emphasize the connection with the whole world. The struggle for the "SM" [*Solar Machine*] on a global scale" [Виразно зазначити пов'язаність з усім світом. Боротьба за "СМ" у плянетарному маштабі] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 279, 15 January 1924). Actually, his utopia proposes one state for the entire planet, with such administrative bodies as the Supreme Council of the Free Union of Creative Labour. The impression is created that, owing to new technologies, different parts of the world are present simultaneously. The novel incorporates large canvasses that, as Pohorilyi argues, became a feature of Vynnychenko's third period (15). Here is how Vynnychenko describes the global conflict:

> Блискавки великих бур синіми загравами прорізують густу, пересичену атмосферу земної планети. Півземлі на півземлі. Схід на Захід, розколоте людство наставило груди на груди... Азія, Африка й Австралія нахабно заявили претензію на гегемонію над землею. Європа й Америка, цей пантеон вищої людської цивілізації, повинні підпасти під залежність од одсталої, напівварварської частини земної кулі (214).

> With a blue glow lightning bolts of severe storms cut through the dense and oversaturated atmosphere of the globe. Half of the planet against the other half of the planet. The East against the West, the divided parts of mankind are set one against the

> other... Asia, Africa, and Australia have belligerently laid claim to hegemony over the earth. Europe and America, this pantheon of a higher human civilization, should become subordinated to a backward and semi-barbaric part of the globe.

Actually, the army of Eastern states, invited by the representatives of aristocratic and reactionary circles, invades Germany but soon falls into disarray and is defeated by the ideas of creative labour. This clash of different worlds was typical of other utopian writers (e.g., Wells's *The War of the Worlds*).

3.5.3. The Ideological and Philosophical Aspects of *Soniachna mashyna*

Many critics have pointed out Vynnychenko's ideological and philosophical preoccupations in *Soniachna mashyna* (Zerov, Bilets'kyi). Vynnychenko, both as a modernist and Marxist, always tended toward ideological and philosophical issues in his writings. Displacement, as I argue in Chapter Two, also contributed to his immersion in the more abstract world of ideas. Uprooted from the homeland and not really rooted in the hostland, displaced writers lose their usual opportunity to observe everyday social reality. *Soniachna mashyna*, as I will try to prove, is a good example of this tendency in Vynnychenko's writings. The writer's previous works (e.g., *Hrikh*, *Zakon*, and *Pisnia Izrailia*) were also based on ideological and philosophical premises but they were more rooted in everyday life and were mostly connected with the "familiar territory" of the homeland. *Soniachna mashyna* represents a more severe rupture with reality and embraces geographical boundaries from Germany to an almost unlimited global space. Here I shall examine how Vynnychenko's utopia correlates with his ideology and philosophy and how it was a dialogue with Soviet and European discourses.

Both ideology and utopia are, as Ricoeur puts it, "deviant from reality" in its own way. When ideology tries to conceal or preserve it, utopia "breaks the bonds of the existing order" (Mannheim, 192). Mannheim defines a utopian state of mind as "incongruous with the state of reality within which it occurs" (192). However, utopia has a potential to project a new future order that one day may become a reality. In this sense utopia "introduces imaginative variations on the topics of society, power, government, family, religion" (Ricoeur, 16). If we look at utopia as being "never quite detached from political theory" (Frye, 40), then we can see the degree to which Vynnychenko's utopia is relevant to his political and ideological polemics both with Soviet and the Western discourses concerning the future development of Europe. In reinforcing his old ideas ("honesty with oneself," criticism of Christianity, family and love relationships, the absence of absolute morality, and the creation of fetishes by people—so-called "bozhky" [small gods]) Vynnychenko also saw an opportunity to introduce them to the Western audience. He also sought to elaborate new ideas that were his response to the new conditions of his displacement after 1920 (a utopian vision of a future egalitarian society, criticism of capitalism's technical progress (already highlighted in *Rivnovaha*), dehumanization, a preference for pacifism, simpler ways of life, and racial tolerance). The novel thus has a very heavy ideological underpinning, which the writer uses to present how these ideas would govern relations in a utopian society.

The idea of inner harmony (first introduced in *Chesnist' z soboiu* as the concept of "honesty with oneself") is at the core of the novel. Only harmonious people will be able to build a new and happy society. Representing these ideas in particular are the inventor Rudolf Schtor and Gertrude both of whom in many ways embody the authorial voice.

Rudolf follows his father Hans Schtor, who says: "People must do everything in their lives that they espouse" [Що проповідуєш, те перш за все виконуй сам своїм життям] (20). Rudolf is honest with himself in refusing to give up his project on the solar machine, even though Mertens offers him "all possibilities to deal with his science in other fields… and with any amount of money that he wants" [вам будуть дані всі можливості займатися вашою наукою в інших напрямах... зможете розпоряджатись якими схочете сумами грошей] (248). Rudolf is sentenced to a "madhouse" (Vynnychenko in some ways predicted the creation of psychiatric wards in the Soviet Union). Even the insistence of the beautiful princess Elisa (whom he loves) does not move Rudolf. For him, straying from his endeavor is equated with straying from his inner self: "Do you think, princess that I can give up the machine and live after that?!" [Невже ви, принцесо, гадаєте, що я можу віддати машину й жити після того?!] (250). Max Schtor is another example of inner harmony. But he, in contrast to Rudolf, has to undergo a transformation. Contemplating the situation in the country and the changes that the solar machine has brought about, he transforms himself from a dogmatic fanatic who follows his superiors' orders to a person who takes responsibility for his actions: he refuses to kill his mother and the princess Elisa.

In a Marxist vein, Vynnychenko continued his criticism of religion, in particular Christianity. The writer briefly addressed this question in his earlier works, considering religion a part of the power establishment, which is directed at preserving the old class order. "God had to be designed for ordinary people," he writes in his article "Pro moral' panuiuchykh i moral' pryhnoblenykh," so that they would obey traditional moral principles and be afraid of challenging the existing *status quo* (425). Vynnychenko considered clergymen hypocrites, who take care of their body while speculating about the soul. The revolutionary Taras Shcherbyna in *Chesnist' z soboiu* denounces the clergy, along with the conservative elite: "Well, if you weren't lying to yourselves, you would see that your devotion to the soul is good because it is good for your body…You would see that your treasury of the spirit is simply a box with the means for satisfying your body [О, коли б ви не брехали собі, ви побачили б, що ваше служення душі тільки тому й є добрі, що добре від його вашому тілові... Ви побачили б, що вся ваша скарбниця духа—є не більше, як скринька з засобами для задоволення тіла] (246-47). Also, in his late philosophical treatise, *Konkordyzm*, Vynnychenko denounces religion as one of the main barriers to people's happiness, opposing it to harmony with nature. In *Soniachna mashyna* his criticism of religion takes the form of a more consistent dialogue, with allusions to the Bible. One can find them in the critique of the Inarac's revolutionary dogmatism, which echoes Christian principles. Here is how the writer ironically describes the principles of the Inarac members, comparing them to early Christians:

Soniachna mashyna	***Bible*** (the Gospel According to Luke, 14: 26)
І одречеться батька, матері, жінки, коханки, роздасть маєтки свої, одмовиться від особистих радощів своїх, візьме хрест свій і піде з Інараком.	[Ісус:] Коли хто приходить до Мене, і не зненавидить свого батька та матері, і дружини й дітей, і братів і сестер, а до того й своєї душі, той не може буть учнем Моїм! ("Євангеліє від Св. Луки").[47]
And he will renounce his father, mother, wife, lover, give away his property, renounce his joys, take the cross, and join the Inarac (85).	[Jesus]: If anyone comes to me and does not hate his father and mother, and wife and children, and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple.

---

[47] See http://www.ukrlc.org/bible/new/4_Jevangelie/Luke.htm

Similar irony is applied to the Christian motto "Love your enemies." Max Schtor reflects on this moral principle:

> Любіть ворогів своїх, благословляйте ненавидячих вас, слухайтесь грабуючих вас, підставляйте ваші ліві щоки, коли вас б'ють у праві, і любіть, любіть ближнього, як самого себе. Любіть і бійтесь, уникайте всякого гніву, злості, ненависті, гріх-бо це великий перед отцем вашим небесним.
>
> Хе! І біля двох тисяч літ живе ця безглузда брехлива нісенітниця (87-88).

> Love your enemies, bless those who hate you, listen to those who rob you, hold up your left cheeks when someone beats your right cheeks and love, love your neighbour as yourself. Love and be afraid, avoid all anger, malice and hatred because it is a sin before your Heavenly Father.
>
> Hah! And this false nonsense has existed for nearly two thousand years.

Although Max is a member of the Inarac, he is depicted as being constantly in a process of formation: from a fanatic radical and dogmatic to a creative and reflecting person.

As Vynnychenko's diary indicates, love for all assumes a pragmatic aspect that is a form of "high egoism, an economy of one's energy … [whereas] anger and annoyance are poisonous and self-destructive feelings" [Любовність до всіх—це вищий егоїзм, це економія своїх власних сил... гнів, роздратованість—отруйні, самогубні почуття] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 117, 27 March 1922). But, in his opinion, men and women cannot love all people, they also hate too, especially in a class society. Thus, to say that a person loves everyone is simply a self-deception that contradicts the writer's principle of "honesty with oneself"—an issue that he will also address later in his philosophical treatise *Konkordyzm* (128-29) and other works (e.g., the play *Prorok*). Max in *Soniachna mashyna* criticizes the followers of this Christian principle:

> Як ви ретельно захищаєте саме до всякого ближнього любов. Начхати вам на те, що любов до Мертенса є—неминуче й необхідно—ненависть до Наделя, до

> мільйонів Наделів. А любов до Наделів є ненависть до Мертенсів! Ні, вам конче треба до всіх, бо вам, власне, наплювать на Мертенсів і на Наделів. На всіх ближніх, крім самих себе, вам наплювать, зелені ви, старі, себелюбні пакосники (88).
>
> How thoroughly you defend love especially for your neighbour. You don't give a damn that your love for Mertens is—inevitably and necessarily—hatred of Nadel, of millions of Nadels. Love for the Nadels is hatred of the Mertenses! But you must necessarily love everybody because you actually don't give a damn about the Mertenses and the Nadels. You, old egoistic wreckers, don't care about any of your neighbours except yourselves.

In *Soniachna mashyna* Vynnychenko also refers to Christianity in order to reinforce his ideas about family and love relationships, which are presented in his earlier works, such as *Zapovit bat'kiv*, *Chesnist' z soboiu* and "Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku." Gertrude in her conversation with an old priest rejects the idea that all her loving feelings are "sinful and from the devil." She says that most people are unhappy with their marriages because they are a form of commercial transaction in capitalist society: "She knows the marriages of many people—relatives, acquaintances, friends, and total strangers—and among these there is not a single happy marriage, not one [Скільки вона знає шлюбів,—родичів, знайомих, приятелів і зовсім чужих людей,—а серед них немає ні одного, ну, просто-таки ні одного щасливого] (36-37). She questions the patriarchal norms of modern society: "Every man knows many women during his entire life. Why must a woman know only one man? This is an absolute absurdity [Кожний чоловік за все життя знає багатьох жінок. Через що ж жінка мусить знати тільки одного? Абсурд явний!] (37). Gertrude claims that it is natural for women to have as many love partners as men do: "…[S]he can't get rid of her unease; she generally cannot help feeling her heart grow still whenever she meets the eyes of a handsome man. It is wonderful and sweet for her to see, hear, and to come close to men" [...[В]она не може прогнати з себе хвилювання, взагалі, вона не може не почувати замирання в грудях, коли зустрівається очима з гарним чоловіком. Їй любо, їй солодко бачити, чути, тягтися до чоловіків] (38).

In *Soniachna mashyna* Vynnychenko develops his discussion about philosophical relativism versus absolutism. He firmly advocates the position of moral relativism, opposing absolute dogmas. His criticism of religion actually derives from this opposition. Reflecting on the Inarac's activity, the narrator says: "There is no absolute morality. The world is a complex of relative and changeable values. One thing can be both sacred and blasphemous, depending on which angle you approach it" [Моралі абсолютної нема не може бути. Світ є комплекс відносних, мінливих цінностей. Одна й та сама річ може бути і свята, і злочинна, з якого погляду її розглядати] (165). But then the narrator ironically notes how the revolutionary stance of the Inarac tends to become anti-revolutionary in its aspirations to absolute dogmatism: "Thus, in the well known preface to the new edition of the Inarac's statute it is completely justly stated that the task of the Inarac is to help the dialectical process of transforming the moral world of humanity from the complex of relative values into the complex of absolute values" [І цілком справедливо сказано у знаменитій передмові до нового видання статуту Інараку, що завдання Інараку помогти діалектичному процесові перетвору морального світу людства з комплексу відносностей у комплекс абсолютів] (165).

This reference to absolutism and dogmatism was directed against Bolshevik practices in the Soviet Union, although there were no direct references to them in the novel. Richyts'kyi even complained that the author talked about all countries but the

USSR (75). However, the Soviet Union was largely implied. Vynnychenko's utopian novel was a kind of polemic with the Soviet type of communism. In Vynnychenko's opinion, the Bolsheviks had confirmed his fears about the transformation of idealistic revolutionaries into new tyrants—the theme of "small gods," which the writer introduced in the novel *Bozhky* (see above pp. 128-29). In 1929 the writer would develop this idea in the play *Prorok*, in which he showed how new ideas based on the common principles of love, happiness, and truth were being corrupted and transformed into ideological dogmas to sustain an existing social and political order. Working on the play, Vynnychenko noted that he had reread *Bozhky* and made a comment: "Contemporary communists should be advised… to read this thing" [Слід було б порадити сучасним комуністам... прочитати цю річ] (*Shchodennyk*, 14 May 1929). But whereas in *Bozhky* Vynnychenko was speaking specifically about revolutionaries (cf. my analysis on p. 124-25 and 131-32), now he saw it as a universal problem that could be applied to all classes and nations. In *Soniachna mashyna* it is the businessman, Duschner, who articulates the idea:

> Так, так, це доля всієї людськості: спочатку обплутати себе з усіх боків божками, а потім усе життя виплутуватись із них, щоб на кінці побачити, що людина є звичайнісінький звір—злий, жадний, жорстокий, брутальний, вічно голодний, вічно жерущий, на всіх рявкаючий, до всіх хижий, з усіма підлий і безмежно егоїстичний (281).

> Yes, this is the destiny of all humankind: first, to bind oneself up on all sides with small gods and then for the rest of one's life extricate oneself from them, and in the end to see that a person is an ordinary beast—angry, avaricious, cruel, brutal, perpetually hungry, always devouring, yelling at everybody, predatory, dishonourable and immensely egoistic to everyone.

Vynnychenko will effectively develop this idea in his later novel, *Leprozorii* (1938), in which he describes "contemporary life of mankind on the planet [as] a formidable leprosarium."

In the criticism of radical and violent revolutionary methods of the Inarac one can also find a critique of the practices of the Russian revolution. Here is how Prince Schwanebach introduces the organization:

> Це нелегальна, терористична, соціалістична організація, що має за своє завдання боротися з існуючим ладом... Головною методою боротьби Інараку є терор. Як відомо її світлості, вони вбивають видатних капіталістичних проводирів, членів уряду, грабують банки, називаючи це експропріацією, пускають часом у повітря цілі будинки (42).

> This is an illegal terrorist socialist organization whose task is to struggle against the existing order… The main method of the Inarac's struggle is terror. As you know, your eminence, they kill prominent capitalist leaders, members of the government, they rob banks, calling this expropriation, and sometimes they blow up whole buildings.

Stressing its dogmatic nature, Vynnychenko compares it with the first Christian communities: "It can sooner be called a sect than a genuine workers' organization… This organization shares some characteristics with the first Christians, although the basic principles are at odds with Christianity" [Її швидше можна назвати сектою, аніж справжньою робітничою організацією... Деякими рисами ця організація нагадує організацію первісних християн, розходячись, розуміється, в усій основі свого вчення з християнством] (41-42). However, an ethical aspect of the Inarac differentiates it from the Bolsheviks:

> Різниця її з іншими соціалістичними організаціями та, що вона в основу своєї програми кладе етичний момент… Їхній статут вимагає від їхніх членів

> строгого аскетизму, абсолютного уникання в якій-будь формі експлуатації чужої праці, безумовної правильності й чесності із своїми членами-товаришами, безоглядної відданості організації, фанатичної дисципліни й готовності щохвилини померти за своє діло (ibid.).

> It differs from other socialist organizations by the fact that an ethical factor underlies its program… Their statute requires strict ascetism on the part of their members, total avoidance of any form of exploitation of other people's labor, unconditional correctness and honesty with their fellow comrades, persistent devotion to the organization, fanatical discipline, and readiness to die for the cause at any moment.

It would be simplistic to draw a parallel only between the Inarac and the Bolsheviks. Political terror was on the agenda of the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries, while the Bolsheviks were officially opposed to it. However, the method by which both the Inarac and the Bolsheviks took power was the same—a violent military coup. And having come to power, the Bolsheviks did not renounce their violent persecution of all their opponents by means of the so-called "red terror," which was later transformed into persecution of "enemies of the people." In the novel, it is not really clear if the Inarac enjoys broad support from society (42). But the general idea of a peaceful transformation of society described in the novel suggests that Inarac would fail to reach its goals. Thus portraying the Inarac as radicals and "defenders" of the working class, Vynnychenko implies a parallel with the current Bolshevik practices, thereby revealing their totalitarian nature and in some way prophesying their transformation into rigorous reactionaries. Not surprisingly, Marxist critics (Richyts'kyi, Lakyza) found Vynnychenko's portrayal of the Inarac to be inapt, as it distorted the true image of the revolutionary avant-garde. Lakyza, in particular, reproached the writer, declaring that "the Inarac's role in the plot looks somewhat artificial, its participation in the struggle against capitalism is awkward, and its tasks and objectives are not depicted clearly and explicitly" (107). Instead, Vynnychenko constructs his own ideal society based on a communal type of life, creative labour, and society, which Koznarsky calls an "alternative to what was founded in the USSR" (76). This is a kind of imaginary continuity and culmination of Vynnychenko's own devotion to the revolution.

Along with reinforcing his old ideas, Vynnychenko introduces new ideas that arise from his stay in displacement. Starting with *Soniachna mashyna*, Vynnychenko's ideas acquire a broader context and are directed toward an international reading audience, a contrast to his works of 1907-14, which were addressed to Ukrainians. The novel should be considered within the framework of general ideological polemics in Europe, especially concerning new forms of morality, societal structures, and international relations. The Ukrainian philosopher Myroslav Popovych points out that "A political tendency is generally an inherent feature of the art of subjugated nations and nationalities that were under imperial pressure for a long time" (57). Vynnychenko's universalist stance is unusual in this respect since he did not elaborate on the issue of political freedom for his homeland but framed his creative endeavours in terms of an international cause. He connects the fate of his homeland with the "struggle between socialism and capitalism all over the world" (*Vidrodzhennia* 3: 500-01). Vynnychenko's utopia, albeit questionable in some respects, was an answer to the state of crisis in the "declining West." Mykola Zerov wrote that *Soniachna mashyna* as a literary work was the "...revision of a capitalist society in its ideological dimensions" (444). In his article, "Utopiia i diisnist'" [Utopia and Reality], Vynnychenko expresses his belief in the inevitability of a new communist society. This also suggests a scenario reflected in

Soniachna mashyna: it ends with a grand celebration of the solar machine and the ultimate advent of a communist society. For instance, in speaking about future progress, the proselyte Max Schtor is now confident that “the old order is dying … We'll dress up the earth like a little dolly, like a marvellous piece of art. We'll turn it into an eternal earthly paradise, where labour will become a pleasure—creativity” [старий лад відмирає... Ми вберемо землю, як лялечку, як один прекрасний твір мистецтва. Ми зробимо її вічним земним раєм, де праця буде насолодою—творчістю] (382). Another believer in the new order, Gertrude, admits that there will be “no borders, no boring bureaucrats, no governments, no nations, or races: all people are just people and nothing more! ...” [ніяких кордонів, ніяких нудних урядовців, урядів, ніяких цих націй, рас: усі народи—просто люди й більше нічого! ...] (529). Vynnychenko's diary echoes this vision of the future society: “How strange and wonderful, funny and savage the division of the earth into states and separate lands that ‘belong’ to one people or another will one day seem” [Як дивно, чудно, смішно і дико буде колись уявлятися поділеність землі на держави, на окремі землі, що ‘належать’ тому чи іншому народові] (8 June 1928). The novel's principal message is directed against Western capitalism as a system that, in the Marxist view, should give way to socialist and communist systems as historically more advanced. Moreover, as we saw above, despite his personal conflict with the Bolsheviks, Vynnychenko during the 1920s and the first part of the 1930s ideologically supported the Soviet Union as the only socialist state in its struggle against the capitalist West (see pp. 243-45).

Soniachna mashyna is a critique of one of the most significant characteristics of capitalism—technical progress that leads to dehumanization. This problem became central to the Western literary discourse, and was addressed particularly in works by Toller (*Masse-Mensch*, 1921), Romain Rolland (*La Révolte des Machines*, 1921), Karel Čapek (*Ruhr*, 1921), and Yevgenii Zamyatin (*My* [We], 1924). In his diary Vynnychenko reflects on the concept of progress: "What is progress? This is movement forward, the evolution of a certain phenomenon. We like to talk about the progress of humankind, civilization, and social relationships. We are even confident that humankind is incessantly making progress" [Що таке прогрес? Це—посування вперед розвиток якогось явища. Ми любимо говорити про прогрес люства, цивілізації, соціяльних відносин. Ми навіть певні, що людство безупинно прогресує] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 241, 13 October 1923). Despite technical (quantitative, in his words) progress, he questions whether modern man has more positive (qualitative) emotions than primitive man (ibid., 2: 242). *Soniachna mashyna* offers a picture of the final stage of hyper-capitalism and portrays it as a blind, totalitarian force, except with more advanced technology, which was leading to the centralization of power and finance all over the globe. Here is how Adolph Ellenberg, a representative of the aristocracy, addresses his vision of the hyper-capitalist society to Mertens:

> О, це не фантазія, ваша світлосте, а неминуча конечність історії. Ви, мабуть, ваша світлосте, не дуже пильно слідкували з вашого замку за ходом сучасності. А ви звольте, ваша світлосте, звернути ласкаву увагу, як ця концентрація національного багатства відбувається скрізь, по всіх країнах світу. Англія, Франція, Середня Європа, Америка, Африка, Азія, весь світ, ваша світлосте, втягнений у цей процес. Всі багатства, вся промисловість, торгівля, вся продукція матеріальних і духовних вартостей життя—все це в руках невеликих центрів, банків. Ви подивіться, ваша світлосте, простим оком навкруги, й ви побачите, яким скаженим, нестримним темпом, якими круговими вихрями все життя стремить до центрів. От коли закони життя планетарних світів ясно помітні й у житті людства. Кожне тіло до свого центру, а всі разом до єдиного

> спільного всім центру. Людство, ваша світлосте, входить у нову фазу своєї історії. Настає доба Королів Землі! Королів-Президентів (69).

> Oh, this is no fantasy, your eminence, but the inevitable necessity of history. Perhaps, your eminence, you haven't been observing current events quite attentively from your castle. But, your eminence, would you be so kind as to pay attention to the way this concentration of national wealth takes place everywhere, in all the countries of the world. England, France, Central Europe, America, Africa, Asia, the whole world, your eminence, is involved in this process. All wealth, all industry, trade, and all production of the material and spiritual values of life—all this is owned by small centres and banks. Just look around, your eminence, and you'll see with what insane and uncontrolled tempos, with what circular motions all life aspires toward the centres. If only the laws of life governing the cosmic worlds were also clearly manifested in the life of mankind. Every body cleaving to its own centre, and all of them together to one common centre. Mankind, your eminence, is entering a new phase of its history. The age of the Kings of the Earth is approaching! The President Kings.

Mertens's office is depicted as a modern room with all sorts of new technological advances, a centre connected with the whole world:

> На величезному столі, *переламаному глаголом*,[48] в хаотичному порядку, в напруженій, веселій готовності блискають телефони й телеграфні апарати—з екранами, без екранів, слухові, світлові, мідяні, сліпучо-блискучі й матово-тьмяні—рурки, держальця, скло, гвинти. Все це грізно, боєво купчиться пірамідою перед фотелем пана президента Об'єднаного Банку, єднаючи його з Берліном, Німеччиною, всім світом (8).

> On a huge table, … in chaotic order, in tense and merry readiness flash telephones and telegraph machines—with screens, without screens, audio, visual, copper, blindingly gleaming and dusky matte—pipes, handles, glass, and screws. All this is piled menacingly and martially in front of the armchair of the president of the United Bank, connecting him with Berlin, Germany, and the whole world.

---

[48] I was not able to decipher this expression.

It is also due to the new technology that new weapons have been produced. Among them is a gas called "maiun," a prototype of a weapon of mass destruction, "which can kill thousands of living beings in a few minutes" (214).

Technical progress, in Vynnychenko's opinion, makes people soulless robots and cogs in the capitalist machinery. *The Revolt of the Masses* by Spanish philosopher Jose Ortega y Gasset (1929) was very significant in this respect. In particular, he revealed the problem of the barbarization of the masses, which could easily be manipulated by totalitarian leaders. In *Soniachna mashyna* people are subjects to "the law of numbers," which is more powerful than "the laws of nature and humanism" (10). Even Mertens realizes that he too is a cog in the system:

> Що він, Мертенс, у цій колосальній машині, яка обснувала всю землю мільйонами гонових пасів, яка позрушувала суходоли з суходолами, країни з країнами, місто з містом, нехтуючи всякі державні кордони, раси, нації, релігії, історії? Що таке Німеччина в цій машині? Складова частинка, яка без цілого так же може жити й функціонувати, як вийняте колесо без цілого апарата. А він, Мертенс? Малесенький гвинтик, тонесенька волосинка з товстелезної линви. Ну, висмикнуть її, цю волосинку. Та що з того? (200-01).

> What is he, Mertens, in this colossal machine that has wrapped the entire globe with millions of driving belts, which has shifted lands with lands, countries with countries, cities with cities, ignoring all state borders, races, religions, and histories? What is Germany in this machine? It is a small part that can function without the whole like a wheel removed from a machine. And he, Mertens? He is a tiny screw, a thin thread from a thick rope. So they pull this little thread out. So what?

Actually Vynnychenko found identical ideological tendencies both in the Soviet Union and the West, which were conditioned by the same process of the modern era: industrial revolution, urbanization, and the rise of totalitarian practices and ideologies (communism, fascism). The preoccupation with rationalism and science threatened to oust the spiritual sphere from human life. The Inarac ideology, which stands in opposition to Mertens, reveals the same preference of the collective over the individual: "The goal of the Inarac is… not personal comfort but the happiness of the entire great collective called humanity. Separate individuals can and must be sacrificed for the sake of this collective. Any act that is carried out in the interests of this grandiose goal is a sacred act" [Мета Інараку є... не особисті втіхи, а щастя всього великого колективу, що зветься людством. У жертву цьому колективові можна й треба принести окремі одиниці. Всякий акт, що робиться в інтересах цієї грандіозної мети, є акт святий] (164-65).

In this vein the writer addresses the issue of the creation of "despots," which he sees as the current totalitarian tendency. Peoples' dehumanization is the main reason for this transformation:

> ...Ці самі мільйони вічно потребують деспотизму. Деспоти не родяться—їх робить і творить юрба. Вона хапає підсунуту збігом обставин звичайнісіньку людину, як глину, мне її, тре, розтягає й нарешті виліплює те, що їй хочеться. І, зліпивши із звичайнісінької людської глини ідола-деспота, вона вимагає від нього всіх ідольських деспотичних рис... Ця потвора мусить бути по коліна брьохати в пролитій ним людській крові й з тихим усміхом або з апостольським пафосом обіцяти перетворити щю кров у нектар для будучого людства. І коли та кров і ті трупи починають занадто смердіти, юрба скидає ідола, топче його, плює на нього й мститься на ньому за кров, за все те, чого сама вимагала від нього. А через якийсь час знаходить іншу глину і знову ліпить, і знову падає перед новим ідолом до нового бунту, до нових ешафотів, гільйотин і бомб (201-02).
>
> …These same millions of people constantly need despotism. Despots are not born—they are made and created by the mob. It snatches a completely ordinary person introduced by happenstance, kneads it like clay, rubs it and pulls at it until finally it sculpts whatever it wants. And having produced an idol-despot out of simple human clay, it requires from him all the despotic traits of an idol… This monster has to be up

> to his knees in blood shed by him and with a quiet smile or with apostle-like pathos promise to transform this blood into nectar for the future humankind. And when that blood and those corpses start stinking too much, the mob overthrows the idol, treads upon it, spits at it, and takes revenge for the blood and for everything that it demanded of him. And after a while, it finds new clay and begins sculpting again, and again it kneels down before the new idol until a new revolt, new scaffolds, guillotines, and bombs occur.

Critics (Koznarsky, Syvachenko 1994) claim that, as a critique of capitalism's technical progress and dehumanization, *Soniachna mashyna* falls well into the anti-utopian tendencies of the time—the forewarning against too much belief in technical progress and a perfect society that, in fact, can lead to a civilizational catastrophe. However, Vynnychenko was not opposed to social progress as such. In the novel this is achieved with the help of a scientific invention—a solar machine, even though it is a very simple construction. But the writer always measured social progress by the level of human happiness—one of the principal ideas in his writings. His worldview was actually determined by the tension between the rational (Marxism, positivism) and irrational (the role of instincts, mystery of life) which he tried to reconcile.

Vynnychenko's criticism of capitalism became interconnected with the current ideas of pacifism, and the idealization of natural and primitive ways of life. Pacifism was largely inspired by Gandhi's philosophy and proposed a non-violent solution to social and political conflicts that were rising in the world during and after World War I. In France, for example, Rolland responded to a society in spiritual disarray by writing his *Mahatma Gandhi* (1924) and *Essai sur la Mystique et L'action de L'inde Vivante* (1929). There was also a strong anti-militarist tendency in Germany, which had suffered great losses in the recent war (e.g., Erich Maria Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front*

(1927) was one of its best expressions). Significantly, as Kostiuk observes, Vynnychenko arrives at a synthesis of "old Fourier and modern Gandhi" (1980, 201). The writer would focus more on Indian philosophy in the late 1920s, after his arrival in France, and it would be reflected in his subsequent works (e.g., *Prorok*).[49] In *Soniachna mashyna* the new communist society is established by means of "peaceful revolution": love, non-violence, and creative labour are the main weapons with which the Union of Creative Labour opposes the brutal military force of the Eastern army. At the same time, Vynnychenko denounces Inarac's radical revolutionary activity, which leads only to violence and essentially to a new kind of dogmatism. Rudolf Schtor is an individual who claims to support pacifism, as opposed to his brother Max, who is a radical terrorist:

> Але я не вірю, що трутами, вбивствами, смертю можна творити життя. Це логічний абсурд. Терор—це самовбивство для тої самої ідеї, яка його вживає. Так я розумію твою організацію, Максе. Вибач мені, але я з нею не можу згодитись. Я... не політик і нічого на політиці не розуміюсь, але я певен, що люди можуть і повинні порозумітися не шляхом боротьби, насили й самонищення, а шляхом розуму, науки й праці (115).
>
> But I don't believe that poisonings, killings, and deaths can create life. This is a logical absurdity. Terrorism is suicide for the very idea that employs it. I understand your organization, Max. I'm sorry, but I can't accept it. I'm... not a politician and understand nothing about politics. But I'm certain that people can and must arrive at mutual understanding not by means of struggle, violence, and self-destruction, but by the reason, science and labour.

Here is how Rudolf expresses his belief in peaceful resistance to an enemy:

---

[49] Working on his play, *Prorok*, Vynnychenko became especially interested in Eastern philosophy (Buddhism) and was personally involved in a range of activities. In particular, he read a book on Buddha by an unnamed French author (6 August 1929) and made some comments on the issues of ascetism, nirvana, auto-suggestion, etc. One of his diary entries notes the following: "The desire for nirvana is the same desire as self-organization. Nirvana requires a minimum of our desires and needs... because every desire engenders either dissatisfaction with it and, thus, suffering or satiety and ennui, which is suffering again. In other words, this is a breach of equilibrium and harmony" (12 August 1929).

> У нас, панове, є інша зброя, у нас є найдужча за всі газові й промінні артилерії гармата—Сонячна машина, набита приязною веселістю духу й любов`ю до наших бідних ворогів... Ніякого опору, ніякого саботажу... Мої панове! У нас є тільки одна зброя. Коли ми здатні цю зброю піднести, ми поборемо! Коли наші ноги доросли до входу в землю обіцяну, ми зможемо й других повести за собою. Коли ж ні, коли не доросли, так краще загинути в любові й веселості, ніж у чаду ненависті й жаху! (567-68).[50]

> Dear friends, we have another weapon, we have a cannon that is more powerful than all gas and radiating artilleries—the Solar machine, charged with friendly joy of spirit and love toward our enemies. No resistance, no sabotage… Gentlemen! We have only one weapon. If we are capable of raising this weapon, we shall overcome! If we are mature enough to enter the Promised Land, we shall be able to bring others with us. But if not, if we are not mature enough, then it is better to die in love and joy rather than in the vapour of hatred and terror!

In contrast, criticism of violent revolution was a particularly unacceptable point for the Marxist critics in Ukraine, who viewed history as a continuous struggle between two classes—exploiters and exploited. "Reconciliation of the classes is very typical of the petty bourgeois stratum, which is afraid of a big revolutionary wave…," wrote Ivan Ochyns'kyi in 1930 in his comments on the novel (139). Interestingly, the same argument was expressed by Shabliovs'kyi a few decades later: "[*Soniachna mashyna*] is a conciliatory theory of the peaceful integration of capitalism into socialism" (48).

---

[50] Vynnychenko subsequently developed the idea of pacifism in the novel *Poklady zolota* (1927). According to the plot, a Ukrainian émigré named Mykola Ternychenko plans to establish the Committee of Human Liberation, one of whose aims would be a ban on war:

> Ми, Комітет визволення людства, наказуємо всім державам роззброїтися в один місяць! Усім парляментам і урядам негайно прийняти закон про розпуск армій. Без винятку! До однієї людини! Всю амуніцію, зброю, військові будинки перевести на культурні й господарські потреби (45).

> We, The Committee of Human Liberation, order all states to disarm in one month! All parliaments and governments must immediately adopt a law on disbanding their armies. No exceptions! Not a single person! All ammunition, weapons, military buildings should be transferred for cultural and economic needs.

This polemic about the ways in which society can change—revolutionary or evolutionary—is presented in the novel. It is apparent, for instance, from the dialogue between Max and Rudolf:

> —[Макс] О, тут великої політики не треба. Тут дуже проста справа. Є дві сторони. Грабіжники і грабовані. Буржуазія і пролетаріат. Так?
>
> Рудольф не відважився б так просто провести поділ між людьми (113-14).

> —[Max] Oh, one doesn't need sophisticated politics here. It's a very simple matter. There are two sides. Robbers and the robbed. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Right?
>
> Rudolf would not dare to divide people so simply along this line.

It is clear from the text that Vynnychenko's authorial voice takes Rudolph's side—he stands for a peaceful transformation of the world—when he criticizes Max's radicalism and dogmatism. However, in ideological terms, it is Max who represents Vynnychenko's Manichaean and egalitarian position. This duality, in fact, reflects Vynnychenko's own conflicted attitude toward pacifism and democracy. For instance, during the revolutionary events he proposed disarmament,[51] whereas in *Vidrodzhennia natsii* he supported "extermination of anarchic people" [знищення гулящих людей]. He does not see any other ways for acquiring power than through a radical ("with a huge rumble") revolution ("Utopiia i diisnist'). Even if we note the growing influence of Gandhian philosophy on Vynnychenko after 1920, it was never consistent, and he seemed never to have eliminated his radical rhetoric. For instance, even in his later comments on the conflict within the Bolshevik party, he cannot trust democracy, associating it with the bourgeois West:

---

[51] After the Russian revolution of 1917 Vynnychenko, as the head of the Ukrainian government, was a vocal proponent of general disarmament, believing that all armies would be eliminated and all people would come together in one huge union (Koval' V.).

> Провадять собі свою ленінську лінію, яку провадили впродовж десяти років. Як було з цією лінією, так і було. А чого б мали її міняти тепер і заводити "демократію", коли це така тонка нитка, що на ній тільки диктатура буржуазії може триматися з великою еквілібристикою (*Shchodennyk*, 6 August 1927).

> They [the Bolsheviks] carry out their Leninist line, which they have been implementing for ten years. It remains as it was before. Why should they change it now and introduce "democracy," when this is such a thin thread that only a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie can sustain it by means of a huge balancing act.

Vynnychenko was even troubled by the liberalization of the Soviet economy in the late 1920s, calling it a retreat to capitalism. He actively supported the idea of mass collectivization, which a few years later would lead to catastrophic results and the genocidal famine of 1932-33.

As a response to industrialization there was a tendency during this time to embrace nature, the primitive, and plain living. This was reflected in various arts: painting (Picasso), sculpture (Archipenko), dance (Duncan), and philosophy (Gandhi, Gurdjieff). The American Raymond Duncan, for instance, was an ordinary dandy, who became a "Spartan," lived chiefly on nuts and fruits, and wore a toga, tunic, and sandals. Together with his sister, the prominent dancer Isadora Duncan, he went to Greece to build a temple for dances, which, as Ishbel Ross noted, "remained one of the empty dreams of the 1920s" (226). George Gurdjieff was one of the most influential "gurus" of the time. Born in the area between Greece and the Caspian Sea, he lived for some time in Moscow, St. Petersburg, Tiflis, Constantinople, and Berlin before arriving in Paris in 1922. Gurdjieff established the Institute for the Harmonious Development of Man near

Fontainebleau (1922-34), which attracted people from various national backgrounds.[52] One of his ideas was "all the separate being must harmonize" (qt. in Ross, 229) which echoed Vynnychenko's position of inner harmony and "honesty with oneself." Vynnychenko's idea of an "Atelier of Happiness," elaborated in an unfinished play with the same title (1925) and in the novel *Poklady zolota* is reminiscent of Gurdjieff's ideas. The Atelier is designed to help people organize and construct their happiness.

In *Soniachna mashyna* admiration for plain living is manifested through love of nature, simple food and cloth—in contrast to everyday exuberance, luxury, and urban way of life. Obviously, it was Vynnychenko's intent to introduce plain forms of living rather than conveniences and technologies of modern civilization. Here is how Vynnychenko contrasts urban and country life:

> За містом, де кінчаються небошкряби й починаються квартали вілл, сонце знову приймає його [Рудольфа] в свої обійми, знову палко цілує в розхристані груди, в напівзаплющені ніжні повіки очей.
>
> Кондуктор сказав: минулої неділі підгородні залізниці та повітряні товариства видали більше, ніж вісім мільйонів білетів за місто. Вісім мільйонів бідних дикунів-каторжан вирвалося із своєї каторги на побачення з найближчими родичами: деревами, птицями, комахами. І сонце-мати всіх їх разом цілувало... (220).

> Beyond the city, where the sky-scrapers end and blocks of country houses begin, the sun once again takes him [Rudolf] into its embraces and again kisses him on his chest poking through his unbuttoned shirt and on his delicate, half-shut eyelids.
>
> The conductor said: last Sunday the commuter railway stations and air associations sold more than eight million tickets to leave the city. Eight million poor savages, slave labourers, escaped their toil to meet with their closest relatives: trees, birds, and insects. And Mother-Sun kissed them all…

---

[52] Among them was Katherine Mansfield, an émigré writer from New Zealand, who died at the Institute on 9 January 1923 (Ross, 229).

This scene is followed by an admirable portrayal of nature (220-21) that is in sharp contrast to a scene from urban life:

> По кафе й ресторанах, внизу глибочезних вулиць, у вогких затінках барів паряться пітні, гарячі купи людських тіл. Нагріте згори двадцятьох поверхів залізо й бетон безупинно пашать теплом і випарами людей. Спалений бензин, тютюн, гас густою атмосферою стоїть, як вода в озері, в берегах кам'яного міста. Небо бозна-де, десь далеко-далеко над височенними прорізами велетнів-будинків. Сонце кипить десь там, над ними, палає, клекотить, і тільки часом дивом якимсь просковзне вниз, перестрибуючи з металу на скло, така бліденька, жовтенька, недокровна смужечка. В руках розпарених, знеможених живих істот довгі шматки паперу, з яких вони висмоктують у себе хвилювання, тривогу, роздратування. Із склянок же вони всмоктують у себе повільними ковтками маленькі різнокольорові дози отрути й щохвилини витирають із набухлих облич лоскітливий піт (217).
>
> Sweaty and hot crowds of human bodies stew in cafes, restaurants, at the bottom of steep streets and in the damp shadows of bars. Heated from high above the twenty floors, the steel and concrete incessantly radiate heat and people's evaporations. Burnt gasoline, tobacco, and gas lie thickly, like water in a lake, at the shores of the stone city. The sun is God knows where, somewhere far, far away above the huge, high buildings. Somewhere above them the sun burns and bubbles, and only occasionally a pale yellow and anemic stripe by some miracle squeezes down, jumping from the metal onto the glass. In the hands of the overheated, exhausted living beings are long pieces of paper from which they suck in worries, anxiety, and irritation. From glasses with slow sips they suck in multicoloured doses of poison, and every minute they wipe ticklish sweat from their swollen faces.

Vynnychenko's diary entries, in which he expressed his constant desire to leave Germany for some place in Italy, France, Africa, or an island, explicitly revealed his preoccupation with plain living.[53]

In the future, according to Vynnychenko, people will be satisfied with very simple vegetarian food, which is symbolically embodied in the novel as sun bread.[54] This is a ground substance made of green grass, created by means of solar energy that passes through the solar machine (287-88). But to eat this bread, individuals (or their relatives) must produce it themselves, an act which symbolizes the elimination of exploitation. The sun bread substitutes all other food and is sufficient to sustain life. Critics questioned how a homogenous porridge-like substance, the solar bread, would have sparked an appetite considering that it is rather repugnant (Chaplenko, 95). But that was exactly Vynnychenko's point: to introduce a simple way of life. The construction of the solar machine is also very simple: it looks like a coffee mill. Its main part is a mineral called helionite, which Rudolf Schtor discovers in the mountains after an earthquake. It has the ability to concentrate and transform solar energy, thereby producing the sun bread. As Bilets'kyi pointed out, Vynnychenko's sun machine looks more like a fairy tale mill from the Finnish national epic *Kalevala*, than the modern inventions depicted in utopian works by Wells, Alexei Tolstoy, and Kasianiuk (125).

---

[53] While in France, Vynnychenko went every summer to the south of France, where he eventually settled (1934). From June 1929 the writer often visited a nudist island on the Seine River in the vicinity of Paris. These visits influenced the writer considerably in his new enthusiasm for ascetism, self-discipline, swimming in cold water, food, etc. In one of his diary entries he observed the contrast between healthy nudists and people "in restaurants across the river," who think "that the beauty and joy of life is to sit at a table full of food, to eat a delicious meal, to drink nice wine, and to embrace women while dancing" (21 July 1929).

[54] A strict vegetarian regime was what Vynnychenko along with his wife began to practice consistently in the 1930s. He wrote: "Stricter food regime: refusal from animal food (butter, milk and cheese), sugar and less boiled meals. Raw garden-stuff, fruits, nuts, our own bread, water, sometimes mamalyga [porridge made of corn and milk], porridge, rice and potatoes" (18 August 1936). Later on, Vynnychenko constantly revised his food regime making it even stricter: "New regime: the revolt against boiled, baked and fried meals. Switch to pure raw food" (2 July 1938). Interestingly, his revolt against "discordist food" took a ritual form. Celebrating the New Year in a "new concordist way" they opened a bottle of champaign, touched it with their lips and then poured it out (1 January 1937).

A naturalistic description of a butcher shop in the novel is designed to cause aversion, and the writer contemptuously calls those who eat meat "eaters of corpses" [trupoidy] (216-17)—the term with which he also defines people in his diary (*Shchodennyk* 2: 176, 14 January 1923). However, Rudolf, who articulates Vynnychenko's thoughts, believes that in the future society, people will not eat meat:

> —А правда, не можна й уявити собі, що коли-небудь люди перестануть їсти трупи тварин? Е?
>
> Сусід здивовано дивиться на вибачливо-іронічне лице чудного чоловіка, але в тій іронії така певність, така ясна любовність, що сусід теж посміхається:
>
> —Може, колись і перестануть.
>
> Доктор Рудольф кладе раптом руки на плечі сусідові, присуває до нього почервоніле від сонця й духоти лице й притишеним лукавим голосом каже:
>
> —І не колись, а дуже швидко. Можете бути спокійні (217).

> —Really, you can't even imagine that one day people will stop eating animal's corpses?
>
> The neighbour looks with surprise at the condescending and ironic face of the stranger. But there is such certainty and bright pleasantness in that irony that the neighbour smiles too:
>
> —Maybe they will some day.
>
> Dr. Rudolf suddenly puts his hands on the neighbour's shoulders, brings his face reddened from the sun and heat and says in a subdued, wicked tone of voice:
>
> —Not some day but very soon. You can be sure of that.

Vegetarianism also leads to idealization of animals, which is quite typical of utopias (35).[55] In Vynnychenko's novel Gertrude questions a cliché about "animal feelings," which are often applied to men in a negative connotation:

> Чим так люди кращі за звірів? Ні, ні, цілком серйозно й об'єктивно! Чим? Звірі далеко кращі за людей. Насамперед звірі страшенно правдиві. Вони не брешуть, уже хоча б через те, що не вміють говорити, а відомо ж, що слова людей на три чверті служать їм для брехні, щоб ховати те що вони думають і роблять. Потім, звір добріші за людей: кінь коня ніколи не вбиває, а люди вбивають людей більше, ніж звірів. Звірі надзвичайно серйозні й поважні, ніколи не сміються. Вони невинні й чисті, бо для них нема нічого ні соромного, ні нечистого, ні неморального, ні непристойного. А рівночасно вони моральніші за людей, без ніякого порівняння. Наприклад, не продаються одне одному, не обдурюють, не понижуються, не підлизуються, не зраджують, не читають одне одному нудних, довгих нотацій. Вони вільні, незалежні, щирі, вони роблять так, як думають і почувають. Чого ж людина так підносить себе перед звірами? (35).

> In what way are people better than animals? No, seriously and objectively—in what way? Animals are far better than people. First of all, animals are extremely genuine. They don't lie if only because they cannot speak. It is known that three-quarters of people's words serve them for lying and to conceal what they think and do. Next, animals are kinder than people: a horse never kills a horse but people kill people more than they kill animals. Animals are extraordinarily serious and dignified, and they never laugh. They are innocent and pure because there is nothing shameful, impure, immoral, and vulgar for them. At the same time they are undoubtedly more moral than people. For instance, they don't sell each other, swindle one another, ingratiate themselves, betray and don't read long, boring lectures to each other. They are free, independent, sincere, and they do what they think and feel. Why then do people raise themselves above animals?

Shattering taboos was very natural for Vynnychenko. Probably, the most notorious intrusion into forbidden zones in his early works concerned the issues of sex, prostitution, and relationships between men and women. In this respect in *Soniachna mashyna*, as Pavlyshyn observes, the writer breaks a new taboo—interracial sex (31). My point here is that the introduction of interracial sex in Vynnychenko's writings could be conditioned by his displacement and exposure to the different realities that he encountered in Europe. In the novel German women, in order to save the new communist order, are encouraged by the Committee of the Solar Machine to voluntarily offer their love to the Eastern invaders with the goal of acquainting them with the idea of the solar machine. The East ("The Union of Eastern Asian and African States") is seen by the writer as a part of the world that is distinct in racial terms and quite eclectically associated with all skin colours, not just white—black, yellow, and brown. Politically and economically it is seen as a less developed and civilized world. Pavlyshyn argues that scenes of interracial sex were designed for entertainment purposes, to give the reader a "pleasure-release" (31). The critic even speculates that in this sense the work has a confessional quality, reproducing "the personal sexual proclivities and anxieties so painstakingly recorded by the author in his diaries" (32). I suggest that interracial sex can be considered more broadly in ideological terms. For Vynnychenko sexual relationships were always a litmus test designed to gauge traditional family relationships—"Shadows of the Past"—and to introduce new relationships based on free choice. Here is how Mertens, now a supporter of the solar machine, articulates this position:

---

[55] A relevant example is Pavlo Krat's novel *Koly ziishlo sontse* (1918), in which carnivores live peacefully alongside herbivores and people.

> Негрська душа така сама, як і біла. А тіло? Га? Честь? "Тінь Минулого"? А чи зможете ви віддати цю тінь за Сонячну машину? Га? Що? Любов? Виявіть *таку* любов: не вчепіться в горло чорно-жовтому солдатові, коли його поцілує ваша кохана. Можете? Коли зможете, значить, зможете піднести зброю справжньої любові (570).

> The soul of a black man is the same as the soul of a white man. But what about the body? Eh? Honour? "The Shadow of the Past?" Can you sacrifice this shadow for the Solar machine? Can you? Love? Show *this kind* of love: don't twist the neck of a black or yellow soldier when your beloved kisses him. Can you refrain? If you can, then you can raise the weapon of true love.

In this respect Vynnychenko reflected the modernist tendency with respect to issues of women's emancipation, which were elaborated in works by August Bebel (*Women and Socialism*) and Aleksandra Kollontai, to name but a few. What is new in Vynnychenko's treatment of the sexual question is that in *Soniachna mashyna* he extends it to an interracial framework. The writer's position, however, becomes quite controversial. In capitalist society sexual freedom had a more individual character, but now it seems to be governed by collective interests, which is what is actually implied in the appeal issued by the Committee of the Solar Machine. In other words, sexual relationships in the utopian society can be transformed from a simple manifestation of freedom into a manifestation of collective obligation, totalitarian in its nature. All in all, in introducing a new context for sexual relationships, Vynnychenko was actually proposing the principle of racial tolerance, which was far from just in Western countries of that time (the politics of segregation in the USA is a good example). In his subsequent works the writer repeatedly explores the theme of interracial love (*Prorok*) and interethnic (*Nova zapovid'*) relationships.

3.5.4. Between Homeland and Hostland: One Novel—Two Receptions

Soniachna mashyna sparked different reader responses: incredible success among readers, a mixed critical reception in Ukraine, and a total fiasco in the West. Our analysis in the previous sections demonstrates that the novel was Vynnychenko's attempt to polemicize with the Soviet form of socialism, but it was broadly addressed to the Western readership as a way of highlighting the main problems of the capitalist system and outlining the future development of civilization. Hence, the writer hoped to publish the text internationally. Vynnychenko's intended audience was Ukrainian (at home and abroad), Soviet and European (German, French, English, and Czech). The novel also embodies a sense of mission for the Ukrainian nation, as well as the writer's personal ambitions to receive wide recognition. Also, we have to bear in mind that while in Ukraine it was a most widely read and publicly debated work, the reading of the unpublished text in Europe was limited to publishers, translators and a few critics. In our case publishers are treated as reader-critics because they in some way represent the local literary discourse and they know what kind of literature their audience might read. In this section, I shall explore how Vynnychenko's great expectations for the novel were differently met in Ukraine and Western Europe. Despite some "technical" difficulties (e.g., problems of translation), I shall also deploy a reader-response approach to show how a different "horizon of expectation" contributed to this different reception.

Vynnychenko's efforts to find a publisher effectively explains his vision of his audience and high expectations for *Soniachna mashyna*. Although his old works were still being published without any royalties in Ukraine in the early 1920s, none of his new works were published there. Officially the writer was *persona non grata* in Soviet Ukraine and his contacts with the homeland were limited. Could Vynnychenko in these circumstances assume that *Soniachna mashyna* would be published in his country? This is rather unlikely. He also suspected that the manuscript could be stolen by Soviet agents and published in a distorted form and without royalties. Contemplating the possibility of reaching the Ukrainian audience, the writer pessimistically remarked: "Should I write for Ukraine? But who knows when it will be published in Ukraine?" [Писати для України? Коли ж то воно видасться на Україні?] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 666, 23 December 1925).

It seemed more realistic to publish the novel in the diaspora, where he had already released some of his new works—*Hrikh* (Prague, 1920), *Zakon* (Prague, 1923), and *Na toi bik* (Prague, 1923 and 1924), even though he was aware of the negligible readership. In order to publish *Soniachna mashyna* the author visited Prague in January-February 1924, one of the largest centres of Ukrainian émigrés at that time. He also contacted the publishing house of Iakiv Orenshtain (ibid., 2: 416, 26 and 27 September 1924; 2: 422, 8 October 1924). Orenshtain, a Ukrainian publisher of Jewish descent, headed one of the biggest publishing houses in Western Ukraine—"Zahal'na biblioteka" [General Library] (1903-32). In 1918 he established a publishing house, "Ukrains'ka nakladnia," [Ukrainian Publisher] in Leipzig. In 1922 Vynnychenko sold Orenshtain his novel *Zapysky kyrpatoho Mefistofelia* (ibid., 2: 143, 11 September 1922) which was released the next year. But all attempts to release *Soniachna mashyna* in the diaspora were fruitless, because either Vynnychenko did not agree to the conditions set in the contract or the project was too big to handle for the publisher.

At the same time, displacement prompted Vynnychenko to search for a broad international audience. None of his previous works were specifically intended for Western audiences. Starting with the active promotion of his plays in European theatres, he also counted on the publication of *Soniachna mashyna* in the West. His interest in the European audience is evident from his discussions of the novel with Shapoval:

> Шаповал прочитав "Сонячну машину". Його рецензія: надзвичайна річ, сенсаційний на всю Европу роман, мусить наробити шуму. Коли Европа не

> зверне особливої уваги, то жаль за Европу, а не за річ. З національної гордости він радить не давати передмов ні Брандеса, ні Гавптмана. Але для поліпшення пропаганди українства і самої речі треба (ibid., 2: 401, 31 August 1924).
>
> Shapoval has read *Soniachna mashyna*. His evaluation: this is an extraordinary piece, sensational for all of Europe and is bound to cause stir. If Europe does not pay any special attention, so much the worse for Europe, not for the work. From the point of view of national pride, he does not advise me to offer the preface either to Brandes or Hauptmann. But it would be useful for promotion of the novel itself as well as the national cause.

Starting in early 1924 Vynnychenko took steps to arrange a translation and made numerous attempts to publish the novel in German, French, English, and Czech.[56] These efforts lasted until 1939, when the beginning of the war destroyed all the writer's plans. In his diary he even planned a budget for this (2: 278, 12 January 1924). Primarily Vynnychenko was relying on the German translation, as the novel made references to local realities, albeit in rather abstract way. German-Ukrainian cultural relations were among the best in all of Europe (Pohrebennyk 1998). Historically, there was interest in Ukrainian folklore, generated by nineteenth century Romanticism. Ukrainian folk songs and other folk genres were published in a variety of collections, among which the most complete was *Die poetische Ukraine: Eine Sammlung kleirussischer Volkslieder* (Ins Deutsche übertragen von F. Bodenstedt. Stuttgart, 1845). The works of several Ukrainian writers were known: romantics (Shevchenko, Gogol, Iurii Fed'kovych), realists (Franko), and modernists (Kobylians'ka, Stefanyk, Kotsiubyns'kyi). Some Western Ukrainian writers wrote in German (Kobylians'ka, Franko) and had close contacts with German and Austrian literati. An important role in creating a Ukrainian presence in the German-speaking world was played by the Vienna-based journal *Ruthenische Revue* (founded in 1903), later renamed *Ukrainische Rundschau*. Wilhelm Horoschowsky, who collaborated with the journal, translated and published a collection of stories by Kotsiubynsk'yi, entitled *Pro bono publico* (1909) and an anthology of Ukrainian prose, *Ukrainische Erzähler* (1909). Kobylians'ka's stories ("Pryroda" [Nature], "Bytva" [the Battle], and "Nekul'turna" [An Uncultured Woman]) were published in the Stuttgart weekly *Die neue Zeit* whose chief editor was the prominent German social democrat Karl Kautsky.[57] Vynnychenko was already known to the German audience through his plays and German translations of his works, such as the story "Zina" (1910), the plays *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, and *Brekhnia* (1922) as well as reviews in periodicals. On 11 March 1924 he sent the manuscript of *Soniachna mashyna* to Melaniia Nyzhankivs'ka, a translator into German. To some extent it was Vynnychenko's bad luck to be faced with an economic crisis in the hostland country, which would hinder successful publication:

---

[56] None of this translation was published. They are probably located in the Vynnychenko archive at Columbia University, New York. However, I was not able to verify this.

> Фінансовий стан Німеччини [і мене] зачіпає: німецькі видавництва дуже скоротили свою продукцію, а німецький читач втратив купівельну силу. Через те сподіватися на німецьке видання "Соняшної машини" нема чого, а ще менше надій на великий тираж, себто на успіх, бо від тиражу залежить і літературна доля праці (*Shchodennyk* 2: 366, 23 June 1924).

> The financial situation in Germany affects me as well: German publishing houses have considerably cut back their production, and the German reader has lost his purchasing power. Owing to this, there is no reason to expect much from a German edition of *Soniachna mashyna*, and there is even less hope for a large press run, that is, for success, because the literary fate of the work also depends on the press run.

As we can see, the press run was important for the writer, as it would help him win over the local market.

---

[57] For more details about German-Ukrainian literary relations, see Pohrebennyk.

As we saw above, Vynnychenko's strategy was to seek a preface from famous critics or writers, including Georg Brandes, Anatole France, Romain Rolland, and Gerhardt Hauptmann (all, except the first, were Nobel Prize winners) and to use Germany as a jumping-off point from which he could extend his literary campaign to other countries:

> Мрії й пляни з "Соняшною машиною" взагалі стають конкретнішими, нетерплячішими. Кладу два місяці на здобуття статті Брандеса (чи кого іншого). Тоді—перший продаж у Німеччині. Розраховую на можливість поширення 20 тисяч примірників. Якщо так, то з матеріяльного боку певний успіх. Звичайно, літературний успіх у двадцять тисяч примірників—невеликий. Але принаймні буде можливість розгорнути кампанію дальшого продажу по інших країнах (ibid., 2: 417, 28 September 1924).

> In general, my dreams and plans concerning *Soniachna mashyna* are becoming more concrete and urgent. I'm allowing two months to obtain an article by Brandes (or from someone else). Then, the first sale in Germany. I think it's possible to distribute 20,000 copies. If so, then this is definite financial success. Of course, literary success from 20,000 copies is not great. But at least it will give me an opportunity to expand the sales campaign to other countries.

In November 1924 Volodymyr Levyts'kyi, Vynnychenko's literary agent, visited Brandes in Copenhagen, and the latter agreed to read and to write a preface for the book (ibid., 2: 440, 12 November 1924). Later, however, when Levyts'kyi brought the three-volume manuscript, the eighty-three-year-old Brandes was stunned by its length and made excuses about his age. Vynnychenko commented: "My hopes for Brandes are shattered: he is ill, unable to work, there's a general decline of his health, it seems his death is imminent. It's clear that he can't read such a heap" [Крах надій на Брандеса: хворий, нездатний до праці, загальний занепад сил, справа, очевидно, йде в нього до смерти. Розуміється прочитати таку кучугуру не може] (ibid., 2: 467, 29 December 1924).

In planning to contact Hauptmann, Vynnychenko was counting on the mediation of Roman Smal'-Stots'kyi, the diplomatic representative of the UNR in Berlin until February 1923 and a professor of Slavic Studies at Warsaw University in 1925-39. Smal'-Stots'kyi was acquainted with Hauptmann's wife and intended to contact the writer through her (ibid., 2: 378, 16 July 1924). It is also known that Vynnychenko wrote a letter to Hauptmann (ibid., 2: 426, 13 October 1924). However, it does not say whether they had any direct contact. It is likely that after Vynnychenko moved to France, he began counting more on French literary figures to write the preface.

Vynnychenko's plans concerning *Soniachna mashyna* included contacting publishing offices in Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Munich ("Wolf") (ibid., 2: 493, 15 January 1925), and Leipzig ("Rowohlt Verlag," founded in 1908) (ibid., 2: 527, 8 March 1925). But all these efforts failed. One of the main reasons was the difference in the "horizon of expectation," which was based on ideology. The overtly communist orientation of the novel did not fit the publishers' worldview. The first refusal came from the Ulstein publishing house, one of the largest in Germany (founded in 1887):

> Перша поразка з "Соняшною машиною": видавництво Ульштайна відмовилось взяти роман до видання. Мотиви: не підходить до їхнього світогляду; майбутні відносини в Німеччині неправильно намічені... Звичайно, буржуазне видавництво навряд чи візьметься ширити мої погляди (ibid., 2: 492, 14 January 1925).
>
> The first defeat for *Soniachna mashyna*: the Ulstein publishing house has refused to publish the novel. The reason is that it doesn't fit their worldview, and future relations in Germany are wrongly outlined... Naturally, a bourgeois publishing house will hardly disseminate my ideas.

Significantly, the publisher openly revealed that he did not share the author's perspective on his country. The Ulstein publishing house's ideological orientation becomes clearer when we take into account that it financially supported the Russian émigré daily, *Rul'* [Steering Wheel] during 1920-24. The newspaper was affiliated with the Russian party of Constitutional Democrats, the Bolsheviks' opponents. Their chief editors were I. Gessen, V. Nabokov (father of the writer Vladimir Nabokov), and A. Kaminka.

Another publisher considered the novel to be "disguised communist propaganda": "We don't support communist propaganda, even though it is astutely and artfully disguised" (qt. in Zerov, 442).[58] It is clear, however, that the publisher did not reject the artistic value of the work. Later, in France, Vynnychenko continued to contact German publishers, but again with no result. For instance, "Malik-Verlag" said the novel was "too big and not clear" (*Shchodennyk*, 28 February 1926). The novel clearly was not without ambiguities given its complex structure, combination of anti-utopia, dystopia, and utopia elements, as well as its expressionistic style. But this publisher's reason for rejection also points to the size of the book. Several times Vynnychenko mentioned that the length of the book was an obstacle, "a factor that will kill it" (ibid., 2: 523, 1 March 1925; 2: 543, 9 April 1925).

While he was still in Germany, Vynnychenko wrote a letter to Levyts'kyi, asking him to recommend someone to do the French translation (ibid., 2: 419, 2 October 1924). In contrast to Germany, Ukrainian literature was little known in France. A collection of historic folk songs, *Les Chants historiques de l'Ukraine* was published in 1879 by Alexander Chodzko (Paris: E. Leroux). Some works by Hryhorii Kvitka-Osnovianenko,

---

[58] Zerov did not provide any reference.

Shevchenko, Gogol, Marko Vovchok and Volodymyr Korolenko had also been appeared.[59] The Russian-language author, Korolenko, was the only contemporary writer. Other writers belonged to the romantic tradition, while Kvitka-Osnovianenko (1778-1843) belonged to an even earlier (classical) period. Mykhailo Drahomanov, a Ukrainian thinker and political émigré, elaborated on Ukraine's colonial status in the Russian Empire in his French-language article "La literature ukrainienne proscrite par le gouvernement russe" (Geneva, 1878).[60] Thus, in terms of literary production the French market was much more challenging than the German one.

Planning to leave Germany for France, Vynnychenko became more and more oriented towards the French market. As a result of the recent war, France was in the grips of its own cultural and spiritual crisis. The generational conflict was evident: the pre-war golden age was dead, the present was in disarray, and the future was uncertain.

> The war produced an insurmountable gap between the fathers, who had written before 1914, and the sons who matured in the years of turmoil… Young writers criticized the philosophical, moral, and esthetic foundations of the ruined civilization whose rebuilding entailed a revision of values in art and life—Leonid Livak notes (23).

The crisis led to an artistic revolt represented by the Dada and later surrealist movements and early communist writers (André Stil, Pierre Courtade, Louis Aragon). Other prominent writers, such as André Gide, Rolland, and Marcel Proust also reflect that period of tense intellectual quests. However, right-wing republican tendencies in politics remained dominant, brandishing nationalistic rhetoric, while French socialists were split in 1920 into the French Socialist Party and the French Communist Party. This created an especially unfavourable atmosphere for émigré writers. Vynnychenko observed this situation right after his arrival in Paris:

---

[59] Kvitka, Grigorii F. *Oksana, ou l'Orgueil villageois et ses ravages, ou l'Histoire grave et véridique de 35 kopecks, ancienne chronique de l'Ukraine*. Trans. Charlotte Moreau de la Meltière. Paris: H. Bossange, 1854; Vovchok, Marko. "Un amour fatal." Trans. Hauterive. *La Revue contemporaine* 15 April 1870; Gogol, Nicolas. *Les Villées de l'Ukraine*. Trans. E. Halpérine-Kaminsky. Paris: Marpon; 1892; Korolenko, Vladimir. *La forêt murmure. Contes d'Ukraine et de Sibérie*. Trans. R. Candiani. Paris: A. Colin, 1895.

[60] For more details about French-Ukrainian literary relations, see Pashchenko and Riahuzova.

> Труднощі з виданням "Соняшної машини" французькою мовою виявляються в непоборних розмірах. Насамперед французький шовінізм і фашизм. Якраз починає розвиватися активний виступ проти всього чужинного в культурі. Похід навіть на американські фільми. Книжки взагалі у Франції не читаються, збут французьких книжок є тільки на чужинних ринках. Французька буржуазія, як і писав А. Франс, книжок не купує. Купує якась група один примірник, і всі читають. Крім того, саме тепер, як і у всьому, похід проти чужих авторів. А щодо "Соняшної машини", то тут до всього цього ще й ті труднощі, що автор—українець, член невідомої, а як відомої, то як "германофільської" нації. А ще більше: зміст роману з життя Німеччини. Отже, виникає питання, чи не засуджується річ на провал, якщо тепер видасться у Франції (*Shchodennyk* 2: 522, 28 February 1925).
>
> Insurmountable difficulties have arisen in connection with the publication of *Soniachna mashyna* in French. First of all, there is the French chauvinism and fascism. An active offensive against everything foreign in culture has just begun to unfold. There is even a campaign against American films. Nobody reads books in France, and their profits are made only on foreign markets. The French bourgeoisie, as A. France has written, doesn't buy books. One group buys a single book and then reads it. Besides, right now there is a campaign against foreign authors, as in everything. Moreover, there are difficulties concerning *Soniachna mashyna* because the author is a Ukrainian, a member of an unknown or, if known, then a "Germanophile" nation. Furthermore, the subject matter is taken from the life of Germany. So, the question arises whether it is doomed to failure if it is published now in France.

After a meeting with a certain individual named Ievseiev, Vynnychenko recorded this in his diary: "Ievseiev recounts the literary customs and relationships among the Paris literati… Xenophobia of the French people and persecution of foreign writers, actors, and artists. They are afraid of the competition from outsiders" [Розповіді Євсеєва про літературні звичаї і відносини літераторів Парижу... Ксенофобія французів, переслідування чужинних авторів, артистів, малярів. Конкуренція зайшлих елементів лякає] (2: 646, 11 November 1925).

After cutting down *Soniachna mashyna* from three to two volumes (each 300 pages), Vynnychenko attempted to approach Rolland to do Brandes's job—i.e., to write a preface. Vynnychenko arranged for a letter to be sent from the Ukrainian Public Committee in Prague, urging Rolland as a socialist to do this:

> ...[Ц]ікаво тільки, чи згодиться [Роллян] прочитати і дати передмову. Але це справа, очевидно, не легка добитися, щоб прочитав. Хоч і соціяліст, хоч і прохає його соціялістична і демократична організація, а всетаки хто знає. Занадто вони просякнені європейським застарілим духом самолюбування й амбітности (*Shchodennyk*, 7 July 1926).
>
> ...[I] wonder if [Rolland] will agree to read [*Soniachna mashyna*] and write a review. It is obviously not easy to persuade him to read [it]. He is a socialist and is being asked by a socialist and democratic organization, but who knows. They are too imbued with the old European spirit of self-admiration and ambition.

Vynnychenko could certainly count on the support of left-wing writers, like Rolland. In the post-war stifling atmosphere they turned their attention to Moscow in hopes of spiritual rejuvenation. The surrealists as well as the writers Malraux, Gide, and Aragon flirted with Soviet communism until it revealed its violent nature in the 1930s.[61] Rolland might have shared Vynnychenko's critique of capitalism and espousal of pacifism. In the end, despite Rolland's positive evaluation of the work, he refused to write a preface, pleading that he was busy. But one of the reasons lay in his colonial attitude toward Ukraine (we shall address this issue below).

---

[61] Later, Vynnychenko placed hope on Gide to give him his support after the latter return from the Soviet Union and published *Retour de l'U.R.S.S.* (1937). "Gide has returned from the USSR and written a book. I think he might agree to write a preface for *Vichnyi imperatyv* and help to publish it. The message of *Vichnyi imperatyv* must now be dear to him and worth popularizing" (*Shchodennyk*, 15 November 1936). Later on, however, Vynnychenko criticized Gide for his turn from communism to Christianity (ibid., 20 October 1939).

In France Vynnychenko first planned to publish *Soniachna mashyna* in the "Imprimerie d'art Voltaire" owned by Orest Zeliuk, who collaborated with Ukrainian and Russian authors (ibid., 2: 494, 17 January 1925).[62] His offers to other publishers, such as "Grassi," "Nouvelle Revue Française," and "Librairie du Siecle" were also rejected. The reasons for the refusal in France were basically the same as those given in Germany—ideological and technical. The French translator of *Soniachna mashyna*, Ms. Laroche, informed Vynnychenko by letter that there was little hope that a French publisher would undertake to spread ideas that were reminiscent of Anatole France (*Shchodennyk*, 31 May 1926). Again, like in Germany, Vynnychenko worried about the size of the book which made it expensive to publish: "Who will pay 30 francs if the norm is 7.5-10 francs" [Хто заплатить 30 франків, коли норма є 7,5-10 франків] (ibid., 3 March 1926).

Vynnychenko made inquiries about an English translation even before embarking on the French. He made an offer to Stepan Panchak, a Ukrainian émigré who had moved from Prague to England in 1923 (ibid., 2: 418, 30 September 1924). It is known from Vynnychenko's diary that Panchak accepted the terms of the work and started translating (ibid., 2: 422, 8 October 1925), but there is no further information about this. In the 1930s Vynnychenko resumed his efforts regarding an English translation, which were motivated by his intention to introduce the image of Hitler in place of Mertens and make the work more current and readable (ibid., 19 March 1933; 23 July 1934). He corresponded with Anzhelika Balabanova in the US, who informed him that a certain Mr. Alekseiev had started translating the novel. The beginning of the war, however, prevented Vynnychenko from realizing this plan (Kostiuk 1980, 65-66).

---

[62] Vynnychenko did not provide further details about his collaboration with Zeliuk.

Having close contacts with Ukrainian émigrés in Czechoslovakia, Vynnychenko was also counting on a Czech translation. Shapoval agreed to finance part of the project. The other part was to have been covered by the Czech publishing house "Čin" (founded in 1920). But Vynnychenko refused to carry on with the project, as the publisher offered a paltry royalty ($200), which he called a "cynical exploitation of an author's work" (*Shchodennyk* 2: 529, 14 March 1925).

Tellingly, during his painstaking efforts to publish the novel in Europe Vynnychenko also thought about the possibility of advertising. The writer had made particular note of the success of the advertising of works by Ferdynand Antoni Ossendowski in a Frankfurt publishing house. Ossendowski was a popular author of journalistic works about his trips to the Soviet Union, Asia, and Africa. Vynnychenko asked Levyts'kyi to present his work in a similar way: "Maintain an independent pose. Don't stint on using bright colours in introducing the writer. Explore the possibilities of advertising" [Тримати тон незалежний. Не скупитися на фарби в представлянні автора. Виявити можливість реклями] (ibid., 2: 493, 16 January 1925).

The following questions must arise in this discussion: why did *Soniachna mashyna*, which was planned for a broad international audience, fail in the West, especially considering that his earlier plays (i.e., *Brekhnia, Chorna Pantera, i Bilyi Vedmid'*), written for the Ukrainian theatre, succeeded, and why did the novel succeed in Ukraine?

There are two kinds of answers: a different "horizon of expectation" and "technical" difficulties. Within the reader-response theory it has been long argued that there is no one meaning intended by the author but there are as many meanings as readers; the meanings of a literary text are the creation and production of an individual reader. Wolfgang Iser suggests that a literary text as an intentional creation of a writer only partly controls the reader's response, but an "implied reader" himself partly creates his own text. How different this "subjective" reception is from an "objective" text depends on a number of historical, cultural, aesthetic, and linguistic factors, which have actually became the crux of the debate and various approaches.[63] Hans Robert Jauss distinguishes the relationship between the text and the reader in aesthetic terms within a historical paradigm. He defines the reader's ability to read the text as a "horizon of expectations": "The coherence of literature as an event is primarily mediated in the horizon of expectations of the literary experience of contemporary and later readers, critics, and authors" (22). Although Jauss emphasizes the temporal aspect of the "horizon of expectations" (how the reception of a literary text changes through a certain life span), for our purposes we also use it in spatial terms: how perception of a work differs in another social and cultural milieu.

In analyzing *Soniachna mashyna*, a different "horizon of expectation" can be revealed on the basis of the thematic and ideological aspects of the novel. Whereas in Vynnychenko's homeland *Soniachna mashyna* was a pioneering work owing to its style and genre, in the West it appeared to be quite an ordinary, if not outdated, piece of writing. To a certain extent Vynnychenko's utopia can be considered a continuation of the tradition of socialist utopias of the nineteenth century, "the most utopian"—in Krishnan Kumar's words—"century of modern times," which includes such works as Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888), William Morris's *News From Nowhere* (1890), Theodor Hertzka's *Freeland* (1890), etc. (33). In the West the recent success of utopian writings was challenged by anti-utopias as a timely response to the consequences of what mankind might expect after the realization of utopian projects. Among them were Zamyatin's *My* [We] (written in 1920-21; first published in English translation in New York, 1924), Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932), etc. Especially remarkable is the case of Zamyatin (former Bolshevik, who was exiled by the tsarist regime in 1905), who belonged, like Vynnychenko, to a similar cultural space but, unlike Vynnychenko, witnessed the construction of this new society in the USSR at the beginning of the 1920s.[64] Not surprisingly, Zamyatin's anti-utopia *My* appealed more to Western audiences, whereas the utopian *Soniachna mashyna* would have seemed outdated after people lost their faith in social progress after World War I and the socialist upheaval at the beginning of the twentieth century. Gary Kern writes about the importance of Zamyatin's work:

---

[63] The following works in the field are the most influential: *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett* (1974) by Iser, *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature* (1975) by Jonathan Culler, *The Dynamics of Literary Response* (1975) by Norman Holland, and *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (1980) by Stanley Fish.

> Ever alert to the first sighs of monolithic thought, Zamyatin reacted quickly to the new mores and institutions of the Marxist state in history. By reducing them to their essence and extending them *ad absurdum*, he not only subjected them to ridicule, but in a sense predicted the future (20).

Zamyatin in his interview given in 1932 clearly revealed the message of his novel: "This novel signals the danger threatening man, mankind, from the hypertrophy of the power of the machine and the power of the state—any state" (http://pages.britishlibrary.net/alan.myers/zamyatin.html). Even the most popular writer of the genre, Wells, whose utopian writings are more scientifically based, seems gradually to have lost his firm belief in progress. In the words of D. H. Lawrence to Lady Cynthia Asquith, dated 1915, one may find the essence of disillusionment in civilization: "I am so sad for my country, for this great wave of civilization, 2000 years, which is now collapsing, that it is hard to live. So much beauty and pathos of old things passing away and no new things coming... the winter stretches ahead, where all vision is lost and all memory dies out" (Moore, 378).

---

[64] An important fact is that Zamyatin's *My* was the first book officially banned by the Soviet censors. (http://pages.britishlibrary.net/alan.myers/zamyatin.html). Zamyatin immigrated to France in 1931, thanks to some influential friends who secured Stalin's personal permission. He died in March 1937.

Although *Soniachna mashyna* may boast a masterfully elaborate language and style (unfortunately largely lost in the translations[65]), its ideological premise was the factor that inevitably diminished its artistic value. The novel became a landmark of Vynnychenko's heavy ideological hand, reflecting his constant struggle between the two sides. Vynnychenko's radical communist views did not correspond well to the dominant intellectual discourse in Europe, which had just undergone serious upheavals during World War I and its aftermath. Socialist ideas were visible in the West during the interwar period, but they did not become dominant, being spread mainly among intellectuals as a form of opposition to the stifling atmosphere of capitalist society. After the failure of the Soviet expansion in Poland into 1920, Europe was divided between the capitalist West and socialist East (the Soviet Union). Fear of communism after its success in the USSR and temporally in other parts of Europe (Bavaria and Hungary) was all-embracing. In general, Vynnychenko's utopia did not attract much attention from

---

[65] Here I am referring first of all to the German translation, as I could not find any critical comments regarding other translations.

Western publishers and was treated rather as something foreign to the Western bourgeois worldview, as attested above by the German publishers Ulstein and "Malik-Verlag" or by Ms. Laroche's words regarding the French market. Even though *Soniachna mashyna* carried anti-utopian and dystopian elements it remained, in its essence and message, a positive utopia about a future communist society.

Furthermore, as Marko Pavlyshyn writes, the critique of capitalism in *Soniachna mashyna* was rather demonizing and the future society was outlined in the manner of a romantic, Fourier-like, utopia in the form of paradise. Plattel comments on this: "Thinking about the future in terms of the paradise can be a symptom of regression and a flight into the childish world of fantasy. Moreover, a defence-mechanism is often at work when one pictures the existing situation as totally evil" (15).

The success of Vynnychenko's plays in Europe can be explained by a number of factors. The plays represent more authentic literary, philosophical and cultural material, and carried a high level of personal experience and psychological observations. Overall, Vynnychenko performed best as a writer in his dramaturgy. In addition, his plays were not narrowly bound to Ukrainian subject matter or ethnographic representation, as was the case with the long tradition of the old Ukrainian theatre, which Vynnychenko came to challenge. Although Ukrainian, Vynnychenko's plays, as I argued above, were to a large extent universalized by their themes and problems. Here is how the Italian critic Domenico di Marco comments on Emma Grammatica's decision to perform in *Brekhnia*:

> Emma thought that Vynnychenko's play had a good chance of success in Italy, or at least in Northern Italy, first of all because it was a drama of real life, which could hold the public's interest by its unusual plot, and second, because the events depicted in it did not apply to one nation rather than another, to one race rather than another, to one political system rather than another, but to all mankind (378).

Vynnychenko's plays, like the works of Ibsen, Hamsun, Pirandello, and other playwrights, made a contribution to the current European discourse by raising such modernist issues as morality, love, family relationships, and the problems of art. Di Marco compares Vynnychenko's plays with those of the famous Italian playwright Luigi Pirandello:

> I am convinced that, as in the case of Luigi Pirandello's dramas, the average spectator cannot absorb all the details and diverse subtleties of *Brekhnia* after seeing the play only once. There are too many half-truths and half-lies in it, too much psychological introspection, which require careful analysis of every scene, every situation, almost every word (379).

Finally, what is intrinsic to Vynnychenko's plays is that ideology is not as obtrusive. His plays do not offer a clear answer to what is wrong or right in society; they show the complexity of life and propose a variety of choices—what Moroz calls "one hundred equivalent truths": "Every Vynnychenko play is a specific playful experiment, that is, an analysis of possibilities and, so to speak, versions of man's life in close interconnection with external circumstances" (Moroz, 141). *Soniachna mashyna*, on the other hand, provides no other alternative than the idea of a future communist society. Starting with this utopian novel, Vynnychenko betrays his ideological stance by what he will later call a "political concept in images," which takes ideas as the basis of the literary text. The popular literary form of the adventure narrative becomes a disguise to attract a mass audience. The genre of a long novel becomes an appropriate form to monopolize the focal point and embody his ideas; the plays, in contrast, served to represent a clash of ideas.

Ukraine's colonized position also played a key role in Europe's "horizon of expectation." Despite its short-lived period of independence (1917-20), Ukraine remained a *terra incognita*, often treated—and the Versailles Peace Treaty of 1919 contributed to this—as part of Russia. Vynnychenko personally experienced such treatment when he was forced by a customs officer in France to write "Russe" instead of "Ukrainien" on his custom form:

> Я не вважав за доцільне розповідати цій слухняній служниці свого уряду, як саме цей уряд у 1917 році в особі своїх представників якраз переді мною висловлював цілком інші погляди щодо існування України. Правда, це було тоді, коли німці били французів і французькому урядові потрібно було українське гарматне м'ясо (*Shchodennyk* 2: 512, 9 February 1925).

> I did not consider it prudent to tell this obedient servant of her government how in 1917 this very government in the person of its representatives right in front of me had expressed completely different views regarding the existence of Ukraine. True, this was when the Germans were beating the French and the French government was in need of Ukrainian cannon fodder.

Vynnychenko noted the colonial problem in his relationships with French, German, and Russian representatives. One of the manifestations of the colonial approach is to see the colonized nation through an ethnographic perspective—a problem that reflects the relationship between high and low culture in a hierarchy of the imperial discourse. In this regard, for example, only works about the Ukrainian peasantry, not the intelligentsia, were allowed in the nineteenth-century Russian Empire. This problem of an "ethnographic horizon of expectation" has been addressed in contemporary post-colonial criticism. Following Edward Said's postcolonial approach, Rey Chow in her *Writing Diaspora* indicates the persistence of a scholarly tradition connected with Orientalism and East Asian studies. She offers a cogent example of how non-Western cultural production is still perceived in the West by criticizing the sinologist Stephen Owen for his biased review of the English translation of the mainland Chinese poet Bei Dao. Owen's main argument is that such poetry lacks Chinese features, thus, it loses its pure national spirit and becomes "supremely translatable" that "could just easily be translations from a Slovak or an Estonian or a Philippine poet." Comparing it with other "new poetries," like Hindi or Japanese, Owen identifies a "disease of modern Chinese poetry": it is too Westernized. Arguing in favour of Orientalism that could be applicable to the study of any postcolonial culture and opposing its narrow understanding, Rey Chow posits the dilemma of universalism vs. particularism. They must not, she suggests, play against but reinforce and supplement each other.

Interestingly, the colonial attitude was expressed by the socialist Rolland. Refusing to write a preface for *Soniachna mashyna*, he suggested that it would be better if the Ukrainian writer produced works specifically about Ukrainian life. Vynnychenko commented in his diary:

> Передмови Роллян, виявляється, тому не може дати, що "Соняшна машина" не виявляє українського національного життя. Для Европи треба дати такі праці, як "Holota", "Je Veux" (хтось його поінформував). Про саму "Соняшну машину" пише, що це блискучий твір, захоплюючий і т.п. Одне слово, стара, знайома історія: українці повинні писати етнографічні речі. Колись російський уряд забороняв писати з життя інтелігенції і на теми ширшого характеру. Тепер Роллян і, очевидно, европейська критика забороняє писати на теми европейські. І тоді, і тепер—тільки етнографія наша може бути допущена. Я все ж таки гадаю, що ми можемо дозволити собі писати так, як дозволяє наш розвиток і потреби (*Shchodennyk*, 28 October 1926).
>
> It appears that Romain Rolland can't write a preface because *Soniachna mashyna* doesn't depict Ukrainian national life. Europe needs such works as "Holota,"

> "Je Veux" [Khochu] (someone informed him).[66] He writes about *Soniachna mashyna* that this is a marvelous and exciting work etc. This is, in one word, an old and known story: Ukrainians must write ethnographic works. The Russian government used to forbid the writing of works about the intelligentsia and on themes of a broader character. Now R. Rolland and, obviously, European critics are placing a ban on writing on European themes. Only our ethnography is allowable both then and now. I think, however, we can afford to write in the way our development and needs dictate.

Vynnychenko had already encountered this problem of colonial stereotypes in Germany, particularly concerning his play *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*. Some critics revealed their prejudice by treating him unfairly not for the quality of the play but for his national affiliation. Typically, they used such ironic phrases as a man with "countless y's in his name" or "hopefully, Ukraine will soon start delivering grain once again," what Rudnytzky calls "the German *Übermensch* syndrome" (369-70). To achieve success in the hostland is a huge challenge for any displaced writer. Vynnychenko observes in his diary: "The negative critique of *Chorna Pantera* is extremely hostile and not commensurate with its success. In many articles there is a reason [for this hostility]: [He is a] foreigner. It's difficult to "win over" the audience" [Надзвичайно ворожа і не відповідно до успіху негативна критика преси на "Чорну Пантеру". В багатьох статтях мотив: чужинець. Важко "завойовувати"] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 133, 14 July 1922).

> The Germans [writes Rudnytzky] apparently expected a Ukrainian playwright to dwell on rustic themes and motifs from his native land, and not to examine, in the manner of Ibsen, the depths of the human soul. This reasoning becomes repeatedly apparent in the reviews... they expected from Vynnychenko a typical *Heimatkunst* product, dealing with the life of Ukrainian peasants; instead, they were confronted with the psychological problems of an artist living in Paris (372-73).

---

[66] The two works mentioned above are based on Ukrainian life. But whereas the story "Holota" was an early example of his impressionistic works about the Ukrainian peasantry, the novel *Khochu* is one of his more philosophical works of the second period, in which the main protagonist, the Russian poet Andrii Khalepa, contemplates his Ukrainian background and seeks a new identity.

Evidence of the colonial "horizon of expectation" was also revealed in the filming of Vynnychenko's play, *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*. Vynnychenko was asked to write a film script that would differ considerably from the play. Thus, he "Ukrainianized" the setting and transferred it from the French capital to a Ukrainian village, and added some new folk scenes and a totally different ending (the main characters did not die but returned to their native village to seek a new life). Even a special consultant on Ukrainian subjects was hired to preserve the authenticity of the Ukrainian scenes (Rudnytzky, 372). Also, Vynnychenko's comedy *Panna Mara* which was slated (but did not appear) for staging in April-May in the "Odeon" Theatre in Paris, was renamed in a folk style—*Chansons d'Ukraine* (*Shchodennyk*, 7 February 1926).

Vynnychenko's point was that not only ethnographic works but any work that can contribute to the current intellectual discourse in Europe (*Soniachna mashyna* raised the issue of how the world should develop) ought to be acceptable. Nevertheless, this criticism by Europeans provides an explanation why in the film version of *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* Vynnychenko settled for a Ukrainian locale. In contrast, *Soniachna mashyna*'s foreignness played the opposite role in the Ukrainian context: the exoticism of a German setting, at least at first glance, served the Ukrainian discourse of the 1920s well by attracting a mass audience (Koznarsky, 1; Zerov, 438).

At the same time, Vynnychenko was aware that the association of *Soniachna mashyna* with a colonized subject (i.e., the writer) might impact the marketability of his book. He wrote: "I want the Ukrainian name to become known. But I am afraid that precisely because it is Ukrainian, in the eyes of Europe it will lose those positive features that will be found in it. It is another thing if the author of this piece were a German, Frenchman, or Englishman" [Хочеться, шоб українське ім'я стало відомим, але боюсь, що саме тому, що українське, сама річ втратить в очах Європи ті гарні якості, які в ній знайдуться. Будь автором цієї речі німець, француз, англієць,—інша річ] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 279, 14 January 1924). The writer summarizes: "To be a writer of an unrecognized and denigrated nation is the same as to swim wearing clothes when other people are swimming naked" [Бути письменником невизнаної, упослідженої нації це все одно, що плисти разом з іншими голими в одежі] (ibid., 2: 360, 13 June 1924).

Later in France, Vynnychenko suffered from the same colonial preconceptions at the hands of the Russian emigration. After the revolution France became one of the largest centres of the Russian emigration. The rich cultural tie between France and the Russian Empire was an important factor that attracted the Russian intelligentsia. Here we find prominent Russian writers, such as Ivan Bunin, Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, Zinaida Gippius, Vladislav Khodasevich, and Georgii Adamovich. Some writers worked in French institutions: Iurii Terapiano and Gaito Gazdanov, for instance, worked in the publishing house "Hachette" (Livak, 42). Thinking about the possibility of releasing *Soniachna mashyna*, which Vynnychenko had given to the French publisher, "Nouvelle Revue Française," the writer says: "Things have not been sorted out yet in connection with the translation of *Soniachna mashyna*. But I conclude that the case is already lost 70%, judging from what an editor said about me to Russians and what she admitted (to Zhulieta)[67] about their hostile attitude toward me..." [З перекладом "Соняшної машини" ще не вияснено але судячи з того, що редакторка відділу говорила про мене з руськими й призналася (Жульєті) про їхнє вороже ставлення до мене, я роблю висновок, що справа відсотків на 70 вже програна...] (*Shchodennyk*, 9 April 1933).

---

[67] Vynnychenko's friend in France.

From the perspective of displacement it is interesting to note that the old relationship patterns between these two Slavic groups, originally formed within the political and cultural space of the Russian Empire, resurfaced in a new environment. The fact is that the Russian diaspora in Europe, including monarchic and liberal groups, was largely anti-Ukrainian, and it blamed Ukrainians for "separatism," which had contributed to the fall of the Russian state. Speaking of the Russian intelligentsia (i.e., N. Berdiaiev, I. Il'in, L. Karsavin, N. Losskii, I. Solonevich, G. Fedotov, S. Frank, and V. Shulgin, etc), Askold Dorochenkov observes that "in the interwar period most of them viewed the Russian nation as consisting of three East Slavic branches: Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian" and, thus, could not exist independently (80-81). This colonial view was, in particular, articulated by Nikolai Trubetzkoy in *The Legacy of Genghis Khan and Other Essays on Russia's Identity* written in Paris in 1927. In his excursion through Ukrainian history, Trubetzkoy writes about the low culture of the Ukrainian people, the so called "bottom story," but high culture, the "top story," he says, must belong only to all-Russian culture: "[A] regional and tribal differentiation of Russian culture should not extend to the very top of the cultural edifice, to cultural assets of a higher order. There must be no tribal or regional boundaries on the top story of Russian culture in the future…" (263).[68]

Regardless of their political affiliation, the Russians were united in their opposition to Ukrainianness. Vynnychenko noted this in his diary regarding the refusal to publish *Soniachna mashyna* in "Nouvelle Revue Française": "It seems that this same lovely "person" also played a part in NRF's rejection: it was refused too unexpectedly, and too much without reason. There must have been pressure either from the Russian communists or the Russian White Guardists, or both at the same time" [Ця сама мила "персона", здається, і в відмові NRF [Nouvelle Revue Française] брала участь: занадто несподівано, занадто невмотивовано відмовлено. Тут натисли на редакцію або руські комуністи або руські білогвардійці, або і ті, і ті разом] (2 December 1933). In this respect, Kaczurowskyj assumes that there was also pressure from Moscow on the leftist intellectuals in the West as to how they should treat Vynnychenko (2002, 132).

---

[68] For more details on Ukrainian-Russian relations from the postcolonial perspective, see Ilnytzkyi, Oleh S. "Modeling Culture in the Empire: Ukrainian Modernism and the Death of the All-Russian Idea." *Culture, Nation, and Identity. The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600-1945)*. Eds. Andreas Kappeler, Zenon E. Kohut, Frank E. Sysyn, and Mark von Hagen, pp. 298-324. Edmonton and Toronto: CIUS Press, 2003.; Shkandrij, Myroslav. *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times*. McGill-Queen's UP, 2001.

Treated as a colonized subject, Vynnychenko viewed this as one of the predicaments of his displacement. This led the writer to lose confidence in his work and readers, and this drove him into depression:

> Крах усіх плянів, а надто всіх надій на "Соняшну машину" створює психічну апатію, вбиває стимул до праці. Для чого писати, думати, шукати, мучитись, коли це нікому не цікаве, не потрібне і ніякої компенсації самому мені не дає? Хоробливий стан,—боротись треба, а боротись трудно, нема піддержки ні в яких обставинах. Невдачі все котяться, як хвилі, і вже німіють руки (*Shchodennyk* 2: 545-46, 15 April 1925).
>
> The failure of all plans and hopes regarding *Soniachna mashyna* creates psychological apathy and kills any stimulus to work. Why write, think, search, and suffer, if nobody is interested, doesn't need it, and it doesn't offer me any compensation? A depressive state: I must struggle, but it is difficult to struggle and there is no support in any circumstances. Failures are rolling in like waves and my hands are becoming dumb.

Vynnychenko's intention to present his work to a broad international audience also contained a sense of mission, quite typical for displaced writers of colonized nations or émigré groups. "We are not exiles, we are envoys"—this famous phrase by Zinaida Gippius reveals the aspirations of Russian émigrés to preserve traditional Russian culture, which, in her opinion, was in danger of being corrupted by the Bolsheviks (qt. in Glad, 52). For Ukrainian émigrés their mission provided an even stronger motivation to preserve their national identity. Here is how Symon Narizhnyi, speaking about Ukrainian political émigrés in Europe during the inter-war period, defined their objectives: "… [T]o inform all nations… about our struggle for liberation, our national goals, our country, our people, and their past and present" (Narizhnyi, 2: 141). The émigré intelligentsia after the military defeat considered art and literature an important form of sustaining its identity: "Being disarmed, we resorted to spiritual arms, which had been waiting in sheaths during the physical struggle. And that is national art—a firm, strong, and invincible weapon" (Malaniuk 1923, 7-8). In Vynnychenko's view, this national mission should not be couched exclusively in ethnographic forms but in new ideas, which would be of interest to international readers. In this respect, he was counting quite heavily on *Soniachna mashyna*: "*Soniachna mashyna* needs to pave the way and get rid of unnecessary obstacles and barriers. This is Ukrainian literature's calling card. It's crucial for this card to be accepted with respect" [А треба "Соняшній машині" протоптати доріжку, відсунути зайві перепони й перешкоди. Це візитова картка української літератури. Треба, щоб з пошаною прийняли візиту] (*Shchodennyk*, 2: 419, 10 October 1924). Interestingly, when Vynnychenko contemplated the possible failure of his novel, he worried most about disgracing the Ukrainian nation:

> Вже навіть починаю сумніватися, чи захоче Брандес, Франс чи Гавптман дати передмову до неї. Що такого видатного в ній? От і буде: передмови не дістану, проковтну сором, злидні примусять продати за безцінь, річ вийде, пройде непомітною для широкого кола читачів, а критики там де-не-де вилають за щонебудь. Поможуть руські брати. І тим усе скінчиться. Хмарне передбачення, але, принаймні, тверезе. Воно не збільшує охоти до праці, але довести її до краю треба. А найгірше, що осоромлю українське ім'я (ibid., 2: 361, 15 June 1924).

> I am beginning even to doubt whether Brandes, France, or Hauptmann will want to write a preface. What is so remarkable about it? That's how it's going to be: I won't get the preface, I will swallow my shame; poverty will force me to sell it for a song, it'll appear, it will pass unnoticed by broad circles of readers, and critics will find something to reproach me with here and there. Our Russian brothers will help them. And that'll be the end of it. This is a gloomy prediction but at least it is a sober one. It does not increase my desire for work but I have to bring it to a conclusion. But the worst thing is that I will bring shame to the Ukrainian name.

Later he reiterated this fear: "I'm ashamed before those Ukrainians who are waiting for some kind of success of this Ukrainian work in Europe" [Сором перед тими з українців, які ждуть якогось успіху цієї української речі в Европі] (ibid., 2: 525, 6 March 1925).

Although during his first displacement Vynnychenko made several attempts to introduce Ukrainian letters to the international audience, he did not speak about this in terms of a mission in Europe. Now he was quite conscious of his responsibility to inscribe Ukraine's identity on the world map and take other purposeful acts in this regard.[69] Apparently, Vynnychenko's greater sense of mission after 1920 reflected his higher level of displacement, and he viewed himself as a bridge between the homeland and hostland.

---

[69] Another example is the activity of the Ukrainian composer Oleksandr Koshyts', who as a choir conductor went on a world tour of many countries in Europe and to North America. Concerts were held in Czechoslovakia, Austria, Switzerland, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Great Britain, Germany, Poland, Spain, USA, Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, and Cuba (1919-1924) (Koval' R.).

However, his desire to represent Ukrainian literature in Europe was thwarted by the sheer size of the three-volume novel, which scared publishers: "Collapse of my expectations for *Soniachna mashyna*. Shraider writes that the size of the work is stopping German publishers even from distributing the book, having spent nothing on its publication. I have to shorten it at least by one-third" [Крах надій на "Соняшну машину". Пише Шрайдер, що розмір речі спиняє німецьких видавців навіть братися поширювати книгу, не витративши нічого на її видання. Треба скоротити принаймні на одну третину] (*Shchodennyk* 2: 530, 16 March 1925).

One must not neglect to mention that Vynnychenko's personal ambition, ironically, contributed to his failure in Europe. The success of his plays inspired him in his endeavours. He had the opportunity to publish *Soniachna mashyna* in a journal. According to the writer's diary, the novel was accepted by the French journal *Le Quotidien* for serialization (13 March 1926). However, Vynnychenko turned it down, as it would not have contributed significantly to promoting the book.

Difficulties with translation also contributed to *Soniachna mashyna*'s failure in Europe. It seemed to lose many of its formal characteristics because of a poor German translation by the Ukrainian-born Melaniia Nyzhankivs'ka. Vynnychenko commented on this: "The translation is so bad that it cannot be shown to anyone. It's a disaster. Not only does it not render the original, it also creates a negative impression." [Переклад настільки поганий, що його не можна нікому показувати. Катастрофа. Не тільки не виявляє оригіналу, але ще й викликає негативне враження] (ibid., 2: 427, 16 October

1924). Vynnychenko actually did not pay much attention to the quality of the translations. Instead of proposing the work to native speakers, he often collaborated with native Ukrainians (e.g., Nyzhankivs'ka, Panchak) who could not do the job properly. Significantly, the critic Rudnytzky connects the success of the play *Brekhnia* with a good German translation by Gustav Specht, on which both the writer and the translator closely collaborated (366).[70] It was more difficult to find a French translator, as Ukrainian-French contacts were minimal and the Ukrainian diaspora in France was new and small. It is known that some French translations of Vynnychenko's works were done through the mediation of the Russian language (e.g., *Vichnyi imperatyv*, 1936).[71] Some works were translated by Vynnychenko and his wife Rosalia (*Nova zapovid'* and *Slovo za toboiu, Staline*). I could not trace, however, from which language Ms. Laroche made her translation of *Soniachna mashyna*.

At the same time the secret of the novel's success among readers in Ukraine rested on its formal features—the utopian genre and the adventure novel. However, there were mixed reactions from critics, both Marxists (Lakyza, Richyts'kyi) and non-Marxists (Zerov, Bilets'kyi, Iefremov), that sparked an intense debate in Ukrainian literary criticism. But all of them acknowledged the novelty of the genre. Bilets'kyi probably articulated this position the best:

> Interest in this new piece is also emerging, because on the cover we read: "A utopian novel." The first Ukrainian utopian novel! The first in the entire existence of our literature! ... There was not even an embryo of this genre, if we exclude the ancient fairy tale or virtuous legend, which in the past lifted the imagination of Ukrainian

---

[70] It is known that Vynnychenko asked Specht to revise the first translation of the novel (*Shchodennyk*, 13 June 1927), but his diary does not state whether they collaborated further on the project.

[71] *Vichnyi imperatyv* was translated by Mr. de Dervice (*Shchodennyk*, 3 January 1936)

> readers from various strata beyond the boundary of real life to other worlds, to the remote future, to the end of the world and the Second Coming (121).

As could be expected, the Marxist critics focused primarily on the ideological tenets of the novel, whereas the non-Marxist critics paid more attention to its formal aspects. Naturally, the criticism of capitalism was praised by Marxist critics and was a factor in the censors' decision to allow the publication of the novel. The demonization of capitalism as a total evil and the vision of a future communist society resonated well in "the state of workers and peasants" (the Soviet Union). Comparing *Soniachna mashyna* with other utopias (e.g., by Wells, London, Upton Sinclair), Lakyza singled out Vynnychenko's work for the original way that it does not exploit scientific inventions but emphasizes the ideological motto, "He who doesn't work doesn't eat," embodied in the symbol of the solar machine (104-05). He also pointed out that "in artistic terms the novel is constructed on different planes: the satire on capitalism is conveyed in realistic tones, but suddenly fantasy is intertwined into the novel, thereby tearing down the entire artistic impression from the novel" (109). However, as we saw above, this is not so, as the critique of capitalism is written in quite an expressionistic manner, characterized by elements of grotesque.

Richyts'kyi's complaint that the novel does not depict the USSR and the political activity of the masses shows how important it was for critics to interprete *Soniachna mashyna* from a specific ideological point of view that would fit the party-oriented discourse (75). In general, Marxist critics found negative features in the novel, indicating that Vynnychenko had failed to convey the crucial role of the proletariat and its revolutionary spirit (Lakyza, Richyts'kyi). Richyts'kyi, for example, says:

> In criticizing capitalism and being unable to depict its antagonist, the organized proletariat, because of his lack of enthusiasm for communism, and in replacing the social power of revolution with a utopia, Vynnychenko has once again revealed the bankruptcy of the petty bourgeois and their world outlook, burned by the revolution (77).

Furthermore, thematic and ideological criticism led Marxists to disregard the novel's formal characteristics, which were praised by more neutral readers, such as Zerov and Bilets'kyi. In particular, it is clear from Richyts'kyi's words ("[Vynnychenko replaces] the social power of revolution with a utopia") that the utopian genre was inappropriate for Soviet literature because it distorted actual reality. For Lakyza, the contemporary utopian novel "reflects the confused psyche of certain social strata in the West and their ideological rootlessness" (103). In other words, how can one write about communist society in utopian terms, if it is already being built and nearly at hand or, as Lakyza speculates, "our eyes can see it already" (108)? A popular Russian song of the times, "We were born to make reality out of a fairy tale" [Мы рождены, что б сказку сделать былью] attests to the fervour to transform that dream into reality. Significantly, only one artistic method—socialist realism—will be encouraged soon after the first congress of the Union of Soviet Writers (1934) headed by Gorky.

On the other hand, the non-Marxist critics positively noted the formal elements, such as the rich language, dynamic detective narrative, and innovations within the genre. In Zerov's opinion, for many readers in Ukraine the novel was "a simple adventure work that 'entertains' readers" (439). It was much fresher in the context of traditional novels, such as *Burian* [Weeds] (1927) by Andrii Holovko or *Chebrets'-zillia* [Thyme Potion] (1927) by Natalia Romanovych-Tkachenko, which partly modernized epics of the late nineteenth century but still contained "ideal heroes" and predetermined conclusions (436-

38). The utopia, Zerov continued, was interesting not because of the idea of a future communist society but because of its "artistic cloth" [художнім одягом]. Speaking about the ideological and aesthetic aspects of the novel, the critic pointed out that readers would not fully perceive the author's ideological intentions: "It is well known that an author goes from an idea to its artistic realization; a reader, on the contrary, begins with an image and then goes to the idea, and, to tell the truth, does not always reach it" (436).

There was another important feature of *Soniachna mashyna*, which was neglected in the 1920s or perhaps it had not been clearly perceived yet. The abundance of purely entertaining features in the novel foster escapist as well as wish-fulfillment inclinations. Richard Dyer in his article "Entertainment and Utopia" connects them directly with utopia:

> Two of the taken-for-granted descriptions of entertainment, as 'escape' and as 'wish-fulfilment', point to its central thrust, namely, utopianism. Entertainment offers the image of 'something better' to escape into, or something we want deeply that our day-to-day lives don't provide. Alternatives, hopes, wishes—these are the stuff of utopia, the sense that things could be better, that something other than what is can be imagined and maybe realized (373).

Speaking about readers' fascination with science fiction and exotic backgrounds, Kaczurowskyj argued that *Soniachna mashyna* as an adventure utopia might well serve those who were opposed to Marxist ideology as a form of escape into another, happier, reality and to obtain some psychological relief during the hardships of totalitarian Bolshevik rule (2002, 163). In a diary entry dated 27 November 1927 Iefremov gives us a telling account of the first steps taken by the new Soviet society:

> Moral troglodytism goes together with the physical one. Permanent poverty and the permanent decline of elementary honesty—this is the result of the last decade. Can we live and make progress in these circumstances… millions of 'blind,' cheated,

> wild, egotistic people covered as though with scabs. This is a truly horrible prospect (553).

A certain Hryts'ko Kovalenko-Kolomats'kyi wrote a letter to Vynnychenko (27 May 1932), complaining about the hardships of Soviet life. In an emotional and ironical outburst he exclaimed that nobody was going to make a solar machine for them to improve their lives ("Lysty do," 334-35). It is interesting to note that Koznarsky compares utopia with soap opera, which also serves to provide an escape from reality (30).

Ukrainian critics also found formal defects in the work, including superficial, sometimes grotesque, depiction of characters, unsubstantiated actions, discrepancies in the local setting and psychology of the characters (e.g., the image of Mertens), ineffectual utopian representation, etc. Zerov points out: "A subtle observer, he [Vynnychenko] is very clumsy in his fantasy... (453) [he] attempted to write a socio-fantastic novel and was unable to go beyond the borders of his land and time..." (456). Many critics also criticized the image of the solar machine as too simple, inconvenient, scientifically improbable, and an allegorical representation of certain ideas. For instance, it is not clear how the solar machine would have produced bread through the sun's action during cloudy weather (Iefremov 1997, 567-68). Noting that "technical fantasy" was not the writer's forte, Bilets'kyi reproached Vynnychenko for not examining current literature on scientific technology, in contrast to other utopian writers, such as Wells, Kasianiuk, and Alexei Tolstoy (125).

Critics also indicated the disbalance of the adventure technique with the primarily ideological message of the novel (Iefremov 1997, Zerov). In Zerov's opinion, it would have been better to preserve both lines, adventure and ideological, throughout the novel

(453). For Iefremov the biggest fault of the novel lies in the discrepancy between theme and style: "There are too many lowbrow elements for a philosophical novel and there is too much philosophy for a lowbrow novel. I would simply like an interesting adventure novel with a rich plot instead of this anemic and tendentious cogitation" (28 December 1927, 567). The adventure narrative, however, attracted a mass audience. It was precisely the point that led critics to criticize Vynnychenko for lowering his level satisfying populist demands and petty bourgeois tastes ("mishchans'ka literatura") (Smolych 1958, 11). But overall it was a great success, as even the Marxist critic Lakyza acknowledged: "Nevertheless, it requires great mastery to keep readers in a state of tension and sustain a constantly changing array of characters and actions (even taking into account certain shortcomings) for 800 pages" (101).

It could be inferred from the debate that critics had not properly assessed the innovations behind Vynnychenko's formal devices. This even forced the writer to explain his new artistic style as "realistic symbolism," a blend of realistic and fantastic images. With this purpose in mind, he published an article entitled "Odvertyi lyst dribnoho burzhuia" [An Open Letter of a Petty Bourgeois] in the French Ukrainian émigré newspaper, *Ukrains'ki visti* [Ukrainian News] (1928). The article was well-known in Ukraine, as one can find numerous references to it (Zerov, 436). The term "realistic symbolism" appears to have been coined by Vynnychenko, but in general it reflects the general atmosphere of artistic life in Europe, aimed at the diversification of realism and its synthesis by means of non-realistic elements. In his article Vynnychenko responds very ironically to the criticism and misunderstanding of his style by Soviet Ukrainian critics: "Does it befuddle you that everything is so real in the novel? That, my doves, is realistic symbolism, and nothing more (this term will hardly explain anything to you). I understand: your psyche is capable of perceiving only simple, uncomplicated, phenomena; a bell from your own bell-tower, a drum, and a directive" (74). Interestingly, the article, which was intended to explain his position on *Soniachna mashyna*, is written in allegorical form from the point of view of an imaginary petty bourgeois, as if it were the petty bourgeois criticizing the novel. But it served only further to confuse the critics.

However, the central problem of the utopian novel, as Pavlyshyn sees it, is the lack of psychological connection between the utopia's realia and the readers' experience that undermines the aesthetic quality of the work. In particular, he compares the devices in the work with medieval narratives (a solar machine as an unexpected miracle) that do not correspond to reader's sense of verisimilitude or his experiences. The critic summarizes:

> Vynnychenko's utopia is anarchic, for it envisages a disappearance of the state, of the money economy, and of institutions governing inter-personal relationships. It is communist, in that it enshrines the principle "from each according to ability, to each according to needs." It is a [sic] populist, because it gives an important role to such mass experience as public celebrations. It is vitalist, in the sense that it proposes a new balance between the release of sexual drives and their sublimation in creative social and individual activity.
>
> All this is true, but as long as Vynnychenko's utopia fails to establish a psychological connection to the life experience of the reader, it fails to legitimize itself as a participant in a moral discussion, and remains no more binding or convincing than free make-believe (30).

But speaking in terms of predictions and prognoses, the critic Walter Smyrniw considers that Vynnychenko predicted future developments in many respects. In particular, he singles out the nature of corporate business activity, the globalization of the economy, and the challenges of scientific progress that may lead to a humanitarian catastrophe. Even Vynnychenko's idea of the exploitation of solar energy, in Smyrniw's opinion, is becoming more realizable nowadays, as it harkens to contemporary scientific search for alternative forms of energy (1984-85, 330-31). Smyrniw, however, does not place Vynnychenko within a broader context of his writings and neglects the main message of *Soniachna mashyna* as a positive utopia that predicts a future communist society. In this respect, comparing Vynnychenko's work with works by Zamyatin, Huxley, and Orwell, despite certain similarities, is incorrect, as they represent an opposing vision of the possibility of building an ideal society.

The long debate whether *Soniachna mashyna* should be considered utopia or anti-utopia also sheds some light on the novel's reception. Critics in the 1920s considered the novel a utopia with elements of the social, fantastic, and adventure narrative. Quite paradoxically, however, many contemporary critics view *Soniachna mashyna* as an anti-utopia (Syvachenko 1994; 2003; Baran, 1997; Kudriavtsev; Kravchenko) that offers a warning about utopian projects. Syvachenko, for instance, assumes that Vynnychenko "falsified the finale of the work and made it untruthful and inconclusive in order to satisfy the demands of ideological censorship" (1998, 69). If we take into account Vynnychenko's statement about the positive and joyful finale of the novel and his strong belief in communism, then Syvachenko's unsupported claim is absolutely groundless. Firstly, Vynnychenko worked on the novel during 1921-24, when he did not yet have contacts with the Soviet authorities and was counting, as we saw above, on its being published in the diaspora and Europe. Secondly, Syvachenko does not provide any arguments concerning what in particular the author falsified in the finale. It would be illogical to say that Vynnychenko preferred a dystopian finale. This reading can be explained by some of the stereotypes about Vynnychenko, namely, as a kind of legendary national figure at the beginning of Ukraine's independence.[72] In my view, Koznarsky is more correct when, pursuing Bilets'kyi's point about the polythematical structure of the novel, he considers it a combination of anti-utopia, dystopia, and utopia. However, his attempt to analyze the novel on the basis of Bakhtin's theory of carnival, with its grotesque, cyclic recurrence and eschatology, is debatable. This may be so, but I would suggest that we take into account Vynnychenko's dominant message, which is the building of a communist society as the inevitable and ultimate stage in the development of human civilization. In this respect, I share Zales'ka-Onyshkevych's opinion that *Soniachna mashyna* is principally a utopian work. A communist society, not a warning against it and not a carnival play, was Vynnychenko's firm position, which one finds throughout his diary. The novel utilizes dystopian elements only to strengthen its utopian character. Zales'ka-Onyshkevych gives us just one example from Vynnychenko's notes:

> От коли б швидче справдилося пророцтво про перемогу "Соняшної машини", себто природи, праці, науки й свободи в житті людського суспільства, та це й у такому маштабі. Коли б швидше настала "сонцеїстська"—чи, краще сказати: конкордистська Республіка Землі, а це мало б велику вагу! Колись напевно справдиться, з абсолютною певністю можу це пророкувати. Питання тільки в тому: як швидко? Чи доживемо ми ще до *цього* здійснення мого пророкування? Які стадії буде переходити боротьба за "Соняшну машину" та за сонцеїзм? Які доби? Які жертви будуть покладені на олтар найкривавішими в цій великій і останній, дійсно, останній борні? (1972, 73).[73]

---

[72] Another "myth" about Vynnychenko was that he was imprisoned because he refused to accept the Nazi regime in France in 1941 (in fact, he was detained for a week by the Vichy police during a regular security check of all former "Russians"); according to another myth, *Soniachna mashyna* was banned in Germany (Fedchenko 1989, 614; 617).

[73] It is quoted from Vynnychenko's diary note for 12 April 1938.

> I hope that my prediction about the victory of *Soniachna mashyna*, that is, nature, labour, science, and freedom in the life of human society, is justified sooner and on such a scale. I wish a "solarist," or preferably concordist Republic of Earth comes sooner, for this would have great importance! I can predict with absolute confidence that this will come true one day. The only question is how soon? Shall we live to see the realization of my prophecy? What stages will it take to fight for *Soniachna mashyna* and for sunism? How many epochs? What will be sacrificed on its altar? What "shadows of the past" will be the most durable, fierce, and bloody in this great and final struggle, indeed the final one?

The fact that he wrote these words in 1938, much later after he had finished his book, clearly bears out how rigorously he was bound to the idea of the future communist society.

In summary, despite Vynnychenko's intensified efforts to enter the new social and cultural milieu in the period 1920-25, he found himself more displaced than ever, suspended between his attitude toward the homeland and hostland, the diaspora and the Bolsheviks, and politics and literature. This is clearly reflected in his writings. At the beginning of his displacement Vynnychenko preferred to exploit his memory and elaborate on his past (*Zakon, Pisnia Izrailia, Namysto*) rather than on his recent experiences (*Na toi bik*). The novel *Soniachna mashyna*, with its local "German" setting and attempt at a universal appeal, marks a new stage in Vynnychenko's literary career. It parallels the writer's evolution—from homeland to hostland—during his first displacement in 1907-1914. The difference, however, is that during his first displacement he focused more on the life of émigrés in a foreign context, people who seek to return home quickly, whereas during his German displacement he seems more distant from his homeland (thematically) and takes on an explicitly universal stance as a (Marxist) citizen of the world, a position that will be predominant in his subsequent works. The future becomes his present and reliable home. Utopia as a genre, with its deterritorialization and fictitiousness, appears to be quite a natural manifestation of the displaced condition. Aspiring to make *Soniachna mashyna* a calling card of Ukrainian literature in Europe, the writer fails to do so mainly because of his explicitly ideological inclination and other obstacles connected with the hostland. Designed for a broad European discourse, the novel achieved success only in Ukraine, and, ironically, not because of its ideology but because of its genre and stylistic novelty.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, I would like to review the main points of this study and outline Vynnychenko's displacement after 1925, the point at which my dissertation ends.

In Chapter One, I have presented a general picture of Vynnychenko's biography, discussed the theoretical issues of displaced writings, and showed how Vynnychenko's case might fit this theoretical framework. The author's biography helps us understand Vynnychenko as a displaced writer, who lived most of his life and wrote the majority of his works outside his homeland.

The concept of displacement comes from contemporary identity politics, which mark an important shift in present-day humanities studies. According to this approach, identity cannot be "pinned down to a rigid linear continuum" (White) but is an on-going process of "production" (Hall) or "hybridization" (Marshall). This vision of identity as a complex phenomenon explains certain shortcomings in studies of displaced writers, which are focused, e.g., on whether Joseph Conrad was an emigrant (Eagleton) or exile (Gurko, Milbauer). I use the concept of displacement as a blanket term that helps us view the writer's stay abroad not as one state but as a continuous process of redefinition and negotiation between homeland and hostland. Exile, émigré, emigrant, expatriate, nomad, and diaspora are viewed as different phases and qualities of this negotiation. They may overlap or succeed each other, and depend on a number of factors, such as duration of displacement, relationship between homeland and hostland, level of adjustment to the new society, as well as the age and personality of the writer. The displaced writers may go through a number of phases that usually includes (1) gravitation toward the homeland; (2) encounter with a new society and attempts to adjust to it; and (3) adjustment to a new society or, in the case of failure, marginalization and even death. This is a long process characterized by social hardships and specific literary dilemmas: who are the writer's new readers and in what language should s/he write? History shows us different patterns of responses by the writer: from existential crisis and suicide (Toller, Zweig) to adjustment and language switch (Conrad, Nabokov).

I have also presented a historical overview of various forms of displacement (exile, émigré, expatriation, travel, emigration/immigration, diaspora, and nomadism). These help us to understand displacement as a dynamic migrant experience that ranges from being totally negative to very positive. I show that exiles are reconciled to their present predicament and have nostalgic feelings for the past; émigrés are actively involved in the contemporary literary process in the homeland and seek to return; emigrants/immigrants integrate and adapt themselves to new surroundings; expatriates are confident of their return and enjoy their displacement; nomads are not rooted in any particular place and may have homes everywhere; diasporas occupy multiple locations combining two or more spaces.

I have suggested that the theoretical studies of displacement fit Vynnychenko's case in many ways (e.g., he gravitates toward the homeland at the beginning of his displacement but with time betrays more efforts to enter the new society; he struggles with his expatriate, émigré, and exilic states of mind). But I have also pointed to a number of issues that reveal Vynnychenko's unique experience (his literary success in displacement, the role of Modernism; his active political and ideological stance; his attempt to reconcile his displacement through nostalgia; his tendency toward utopianism, which revealed his extreme uprootedness; gravitation toward universalist themes, and search for a new audience).

In Chapter Two, I examined the dynamics of Vynnychenko's first displacement (1907-14) during which he exhibited characteristics of the traveler, émigré, expatriate, and exile. It was important for me to emphasize displacement first as an intrinsic characteristic of Modernism, with its new technologies, communication, and urbanization. Many artists found themselves in forced (Conrad), self-imposed (Joyce), or voluntary (American expatriates) displacement that gave them a sense of freedom, sharpened their artistic vision, and fostered their creativity. Gathered in big cities (Paris, London, Berlin, and Zurich) and partaking in a Bohemian way of life, they were preoccupied with new aesthetic and philosophical ideas (e.g., Marxism, Darwinism, Nietzscheanism, Bergsonianism, and Freudianism) that inspired them toward experiments with both styles and themes.

Being a part of European cultural life, Ukrainian Modernism boasted similar characteristics: anti-populism, individualism, urbanism, socialism, feminism, aesthetism, intellectualism, social and national preoccupation, and orientation on Europe. The ideological encroachment of European Modernism in Ukraine stimulated more openness to the "other" and a desire for travel and seeing the world. I noted that most, if not all, Ukrainian modernists were travelers, expatriates, or exiles, who took advantages of the new possibilities of communication (Lesia Ukrainka, Kotsiubyns'kyi, Voronyi, Stefanyk, Karmans'kyi, Kurbas, and Archipenko). No doubt, physical travel had a significant impact on young modernists, who gained new impressions and ideas, and a new vision of the world. As Lesia Ukrainka confessed: "I have awakened and it is difficult, pitiful, and painful" (1975, 10: 83).

Vynnychenko fits this framework of a displaced European modernist writer quite well. Having grown up on traditional Ukrainian literature, he revealed his modernist stance early in his search for new themes and forms ("Krasa i syla," *Dyzharmoniia*). In ideological terms, Vynnychenko typifies the radical revolutionary of the *fin de siecle*, who was preoccupied with transformating the world. As a Marxist he emphasized literary content (ideas), whereas literary form, in his opinion, had to convey thoughts in a relevant way ("Sposterezhennia neprofesionala"). This Marxist positivism was, however, counterbalanced by his interest in irrational human drives, such as the strong Nietzschean individual (*Chesnist' z soboiu*) and Bergson's idea of the stream of life ("Moment," "Promin' sontsia"). On the other hand, Vynnychenko's physical presence in Europe significantly extended and modified his modernist worldview and helped him develop a new vision. This occurred through his travels, contacts with people, self-education and intellectual growth, as well as his sense of personal freedom. During 1907-14 Vynnychenko enjoyed sojourns in such places as Geneva, Zurich, Capri, Paris, Florence, and L'viv, which he later fondly recollected (*Shchodennyk* 1: 269-72, 19 July 1917). In Europe he encountered a variety of people, mainly artistic intellectuals and revolutionaries, most of whom were émigrés from the Russian Empire (Gorky, Lunacharskii, Bogdanov). During these encounters he introduced his new works and participated in political and artistic discussions. He studied foreign languages and read contemporary literature on heredity (Shimkevich, Gerovich), morality (Bertel) and love of nature (Belshe), as well as works by Bergson, Renan, and Wagner-Jauregg. A very important factor for Vynnychenko was having the freedom to write, which he could hardly have had at home, considering that he was always wanted by the police.

One corollary of Vynnychenko's modernist stances as well as of his displacement was his preoccupation with art and beauty. I argue that a displaced writer who has lost touch with the social reality of his homeland may have a tendency to emphasize the world of art and beauty—namely a more abstract, ideal, and perfect world. This concern found its way into a number of works set in the hostland, such as *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and "Olaf Stefenzon." Both works portray the international artistic life of Parisian Bohemia, which featured discussions about art. In both works the author expresses his Marxist view on the close connection between art and life (in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* the lack of this connection leads to death; in "Olaf Stefenzon"—to individual conflict). These two works also show Vynnychenko's interest in formal innovations: elements of symbolism surface in *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* and elements of folk and adventure narrative in "Olaf Stefenzon."

Although Vynnychenko was away from his homeland during 1907-14, it was the main focus of his attention. During this period he became the most acclaimed Ukrainian writer (Kotsiubyns'kyi 1988), the author of approximately forty works. His dramaturgy, along with the plays of Lesia Ukrainka, Oleksandr Oles', and Spyrydon Cherkasenko, symbolized the rupture with traditional Ukrainian drama based on folkloric motifs and the creation of a new modernist theatre. Through translations (and some original works in Russian), he also made his way into Russian literature.

I try to emphasize that it was not only Modernism that informed the new directions in Vynnychenko's writings but also his displacement. Among the characteristics generated by displacement I have singled out his strong sense of national preoccupation, the tendency toward abstract ideas, his critical perspective of the homeland from a distance, and his provocative themes and manner of communicating with the public. His national preoccupation can be explained not only by his "literary responses to political repression" (Lagos-Pope) in the homeland but also as a form of gravitation toward "familiar territory" (Seidel), which elicited in the writer more "artistic sensitivity" (Gurr). Significantly, 36 out of 40 Vynnychenko's works in this period are set in Ukraine; yet even in the remaining four works that are deliberately set in the hostland (i.e., "Taina," *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, "Olaf Stefenzon," and *Rivnovaha*) Vynnychenko says little about the local space and predominantly deals with the life of émigré compatriots.

However, in time the "familiar territory" gradually becomes more remote and the writer finds himself in an abstract world of ideas, something as he confesses in his letters to Chykalenko. This was a turning point in Vynnychenko's literary career, attesting to his shift from realistic depictions of everyday life (with a focus on social issues) to philosophical reflections and intellectual analyses of problematic moral issues. The perspective of distance, along with self-reflection (hence, the role of his diaries and the introduction of diaries to his writings) and a strong ideological focus were the factors that gave Vynnychenko the opportunity to introduce new and fresh ideas into the intellectual and cultural life of Ukrainian society. In particular, I touched upon the issues of the corruption of revolutionary ideals (*Bazar*), the relativity of absolute truth (*Brekhnia*), sex and love (*Chesnist' z soboiu*), prostitution (*Zapovit bat'kiv*) and family relationships ("Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku"). Vynnychenko felt liberated from the social ties and obligations of the homeland, and geographical distance lent him a sense of individual freedom that fostered his provocative attitude. His conflict with critics (Iefremov, Steshenko) who objected to his new "sophisticated" works, contributed to his alienation and detachment from Ukrainian society, so that, he assumed, one day he could go into self-imposed exile. During 1907-14 Vynnychenko's stay abroad stimulated his intellect and work of memory, but he predicted for himself creative exhaustion unless he regained his native social and cultural environment.

As Vynnychenko gravitated toward his homeland in this period, his attitude toward the hostland became more complex. On the one hand, he was attracted by freedom, the ability to travel, and the possibilities of intellectual growth, yet at the same time he was quite reluctant to adjust to the new milieu. The writer's displacement embraces a gamut of experiences and feelings: from the joy of expatriation to the bitterness of exile. I showed his positive mood in expatriation, which later confronts the unbearable challenge of exile, and then resorts to nostalgia as a form of reconciling the two. A sense of expatriation as a "soft" form of displacement (Tucker)—which rests on close ties with the homeland and the possibility of a return—is presented in the story "Taina." The Ukrainian expatriate Perederiienko is depicted as a person with a positive worldview (in contrast to the Parisian professor Laroche) who, despite all difficulties, enjoys the foreign land because he has a home, which still awaits his return.

At the same time Vynnychenko had to deal with the rupture of his relationship with the homeland and the rise of exilic feelings owing to his long-term geographical displacement. This rupture was accompanied by difficult social conditions, a sense of isolation from the homeland, and uncertainty about the future, which led to a nervous breakdown and escapist thoughts. The novel *Rivnovaha* is Vynnychenko's reflections on his current status as an exile and on the fate of those people who took part in the 1905-1907 revolution in the Russian Empire and were forced into exile to escape tsarist repressions. Exile is depicted as a social condition that impacts revolutionaries in various ways. Our analysis of characters demonstrated that many exiles were negatively affected by their displacement: they stagnated, degenerated, squabbled, resorted to violence, crime, inebriation, anarchy, or Satanism. The author implies that true revolutionaries, in order to sustain their identity, must return home and continue their revolutionary activity, as the protagonists (Khoma, Tania, Fenia, and Mary) do. The novel also signifies a shift in the Vynnychenko's character type: from a stoic revolutionary in *Chesnist' z soboiu* to an alienated individual (the image of Khoma). As Vynnychenko's correspondence indicates, returning home at any cost was his personal solution to his own displacement. In point of fact, in 1914, a few years after Vynnychenko finished this novel, he and his wife Rosalia disguised themselves in peasant clothing and, carrying false passports, returned illegally to Ukraine.

If there is a problem with returning home and exile is intolerable, the mechanism of nostalgia helps the displaced person to reconcile his anxieties. Referring to works of Davis, Ritivoy, and Boym, I consider nostalgia as a protective mechanism that balances one's personality by connecting the past with the present and transforming the past, even if it is negative, into positive experiences. Among the forms of aesthetic modalities that create a nostalgic mood I distinguish lyrical prologues and passages, landscapes, climate descriptions, childhood memories, and "hyperrealistic" (Davis) details. These elements are not an exclusive characteristic of any one work but are dispersed throughout

Vynnychenko's writings on revolutionary, artistic, and exile themes ("Zina," "Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku," *Rivnovaha*, etc). Only his children's stories ("Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" and "Kumediia z Kostem")—with their return to the "golden age" of childhood—correspond more closely to his nostalgia. Analysis of the former reveal the writer's own allusions to his childhood, which is presented through the image of the trouble-making boy Fed'ko and conveyed by elements of realistic description, including children's activities, landscape, weather, songs, and a lyrical mood.

In Chapter Three, I examined Vynnychenko's stay abroad during 1920-25, characterizing this as a period of his extreme uprootedness. He lived for a time in Czechoslovakia (Prague and Karlsbad, 1920-1921) but mostly in Germany (Berlin, Zehlendorf, and Rauen, 1921-1925). This was the first stage of his final displacement, which would last until the writer's death in 1951. To limit the length of my study, I use the year 1925, when Vynnychenko moved to France, as the cut-off date, although I make some references to later developments when pertinent to the discussion. I excluded from my analysis the period 1914-20, a period when Vynnychenko returned home and was actively involved in politics (he was the first Chairman of the General Secretariat of the Central Rada, 1917-18; and the Co-Chairman of the Directory, 1918-19). For a while Vynnychenko stayed in Moscow (1914-17), a city that belonged to the common imperial space, with shared social, political, and cultural institutions, the reason I did not include this period in the study.

Although Ukrainian émigrés had financial support from the Czechoslovakian government and established a number of institutions (e.g., the Ukrainian Sociological Institute in Prague and Agricultural Academy in Przibram, etc), Vynnychenko preferred

Germany. The Weimar Republic (1918-33), with its easy visa procedures, cheap post-war living, a highly developed book-publishing industry, and flourishing cultural life served as a magnet attracting artists and intellectuals from various countries.

In contrast to his first displacement (1907-14), Vynnychenko made more efforts to adjust to the hostland. He plunged deeply into the world of literature, art, and philosophy by reading (Guyau, Schopenhauer, Wundt, Stekel), attending exhibitions (Monet, Kokoschka, Liebermann, Dix; the Ukrainian painters Hlushchenko, Babii, and Sobachko), plays (plays by Schnitzer, Hamsun, Gorky, Ansky, and Shaw), cinemas (*Anne Boleyn*, *Rund um die Ehe*, *Danton*, *Quo Vadis*, and Charlie Chaplin's films), and attempting to attract the European audience with his works. A great fan of film, Vynnychenko worked on a number of film scripts (*Pisnia Izrailia*, *Soniachna mashyna*, and *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*). In 1921 the latter work was made into a German film entitled *Die schwarze Pantherin*. During this period he collaborated not only with Russian (the literary group "Skify," the Russian Drama Theatre, Russian publishers ("Vozrozhdeniie," Diakova, and Gutnov), and Georgian émigrés (Dumbadze), but also actively sought connections with local artistic and business circles (Kiepenheuer, Specht, Guter). His efforts to enter the new society resulted in successful promotion of his plays—*Brekhnia*, *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'*, and *Hrikh*—which appeared in many European countries (Germany, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Spain, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria, Poland, Yugoslavia, Norway, and Denmark).

Paradoxically, Vynnychenko's adjustment and recognition in Europe led to tensions between his national and social preoccupations, between his attitude toward the diaspora and the Bolsheviks, between his commitments to politics and literature, and even caused inner conflicts and a search for new meanings in life. He vacillated between supporting a national Ukrainian state with right-wing elements and a socialist state controlled by the Bolshevik government in Moscow—eventually breaking with both. Although he was declared *persona non grata* in the Soviet Union (1921), his attitude to the Bolsheviks was mixed: he denounced the Bolshevik rule as oppressive and imperialistic; at the same time he shared with them common ideological views on socialism and communism, expressessing his belief in a "Great World Revolution ("Utopiia i diisnist'"). Vynnychenko's contradictions grew as he concluded that the real practice of building socialism diverged radically from the ideal communist society. This discrepancy between the high expectations of a world revolution and the sober reality of socialist practice, between his loathing of "bourgeois Europe" (which gave him asylum) and support for the USSR (which had expelled him) largely determined his psychological state of mind.

Although his old works were still being published in Ukraine and his plays continued to be popular, Vynnychenko began experiencing feelings of difference, otherness, and alienation from what was happening in his country. Thematically, his works there were becoming increasingly outdated. The complexity of the cultural discussion among different artistic trends and groups in Ukraine seemed to confuse and alienate the writer.

Another conflict that reveals Vynnychenko's state of ambiguity is the clash between politics and literature. The collapse of Ukrainian statehood and the defeat of the revolution, to which he had totally devoted himself for twenty years, was a severe blow for Vynnychenko. Moreover, the revolution was defeated not by monarchist forces but by the Bolsheviks, his former colleagues and allies with whom he had collaborated and shared the difficulties of pre-war exile. After his political defeat, Vynnychenko believed literature would be a relevant domain into which he could channel his creative energy. He concluded that it would be better for him to engage in literature abroad. This was a significant transformation compared to his first displacement, when he complained about his absence from the homeland and lack of fresh impressions. For a person deeply rooted in his country and preoccupied with its political and cultural fate, it was a bitter step to admit to this new exile. Vynnychenko, however, never lost his interest in politics and saw literature as a means of serving the revolution in ideological terms. As the economic crisis in Germany intensified, Vynnychenko's inner conflicts grew, ranging from a desire to embrace the whole world to feelings of existential emptiness, and a desire to escape from this world—all of which he expressed in his diary. During this period he almost never spoke about wishing to return home, as he did in his letters to Chykalenko during his first displacement.

Further on, I examined how Vynnychenko's new state of displacement was reflected in his writings. During his stay in Germany he was quite productive as a writer, managing to write such works as *Zakon* (1921), *Pisnia Izrailia* (1921-22), *Na toi bik* (1919-23), two children's stories based on folklore motifs for the collection *Namysto* (1922), and the three-volume novel *Soniachna mashyna* (1921-1924). In general his new works, with the exception of the latter, seem to add little to his writings in terms of reflecting his new reality. They brought the writer back to his old moral dramas (*Zakon*) or events of the 1905-07 revolution (*Pisnia Izrailia*) or even his childhood (*Namysto*). His plays, on the other hand, attested to his commercial interests. Vynnychenko addressed his recent revolutionary experiences (1917-20) only in the novel *Na toi bik*, although he abandoned the work for some time (he started it in 1919 and finished in 1923) and made some digressions into the protagonists' past. In contrast, the writings of his contemporaries, both émigrés and those in Ukraine, were permeated almost exclusively by recent social developments. All this might signal a kind of stagnation, and Vynnychenko was indeed criticized by both émigré (Malaniuk) and Soviet Ukrainian (Smolych) critics. Seeking his new identity in Europe and responding to his uprootedness, the writer addressed the issue of the future communist society in his utopian novel *Soniachna mashyna*. Vynnychenko's previous gravitation toward the homeland (1907-14) was now transformed into a new orientation: a focus on a broader international cultural space. He articulated his sense of belonging to the whole planet, adopted a kind of "world citizenship," and spoke more in terms of "my planet," "my globe," and "the earth"—something that he did not do before.

The three-volume utopian novel *Soniachna mashyna* revealed a cardinal shift in Vynnychenko's thematic and stylistic interests and determined the future direction of his writing. The novel became one of the most popular and innovative works in Ukrainian literature of the late 1920s and was published in five editions (one in Russian) during the period 1928-30. Its critical reception, however, was contradictory, ranging from total admiration (Kosynka) to outright rejection as a "pretentious and blatant work" (Iefremov). Starting with an examination of the novel's plot, structure and style, I then focused on how his preoccupation with utopia corresponded to his displacement, how the novel recapitulated his ideological and philosophical concerns, and the differences in the reception of the novel in Ukraine and in the West.

In formal terms, Vynnychenko in *Soniachna mashyna* moved from realistic and impressionistic writing to a more pronounced non-realistic style that included elements of Expressionism, cinematic devices, and the adventure story, to whose influence he was exposed during his displacement. Expressionism, which especially flourished in Germany throughout the 1920s, with its subjective emotionality, exaggeration and distortion of reality, symbolic representation, satire on bourgeois values, apocalyptic visions, and concern with social and political reform, became a very suitable literary form for Vynnychenko.

In my opinion, utopia as a genre, is a very appropriate form for displaced writers, as it tends to appear as a result of a dissatisfaction with life in the present world, serves as a response to a state of crisis in society, and acts as a promise that a given reality can be transcended. As a literary genre it has a wish-fulfillment function. I suggest that *Soniachna mashyna* served to channel Vynnychenko's escapist tendency and alleviated his anxiety and uncertainty about the present by projecting a better future. Whereas the children's stories reflect his nostalgia for the past, utopia reflects the work of "future-oriented nostalgia" (Nowas and Platt).

Soniachna mashyna represents a more severe rupture with reality but leads Vynnychenko to greater ideological involvement in both the Soviet and Western discourses. The writer revisits his old ideas ("honesty with oneself," criticism of Christianity, family and love relationships, the absence of absolute morality, and the creation of fetishes by people—so called "bozhky" [small gods]). He also elaborates new ideas that formed his response to the conditions of his displacement after 1920 (a utopian vision of a future egalitarian society, criticism of capitalism's technical progress, of dehumanization; promotion of pacifism, simple ways of life, and racial tolerance). All these ideas acquired a broader context and were designed for an international reading audience, in contrast to his works written during 1907-14, which were addressed to a Ukrainian audience. The novel must be considered within the framework of general ideological polemics in Europe, especially the concern with new forms of morality, societal structures, and international relations. Ukraine was seen as a part of that process. In many respects Vynnychenko's ideas reflect the critical attitude of Western intellectuals toward the capitalist system and their quest for new solutions (Rolland, Čapek, Toller, Gandhi's philosophy, primitivism in art, admiration for plain living). But Vynnychenko's views also appeared quite naïve and unrealistic (the idea of a perfect society, idealization of animals) and led to a very mixed reception of the novel.

Soniachna mashyna sparked different reader responses: while this novel enjoyed great success among Ukrainian readers and a mixed critical reception among critics, it was a total flop in the West. I explained this discrepancy by suggesting a different "horizon of expectation" (Jauss) in the respective audiences. While in Ukraine it was the widely debated work, the reading of the unpublished text in Europe was limited to publishers and a few critics. Whereas in Vynnychenko's homeland *Soniachna mashyna* was seen as a pioneering work offering also psychological relief from the hardships of totalitarian Bolshevik rule, in the West it appeared to be quite an ordinary, if not outdated, piece of writing, challenged by anti-utopias as a timely response to the consequences of what mankind might expect after the realization of this utopian project (Zamyatin's *My*, Huxley's *Brave New World*, etc). Despite numerous attempts to publish the novel (in German, French, English and Czech), it was treated by Western publishers as something foreign to Western bourgeois tastes (this was attested by the German publishers Ulstein and "Malik-Verlag" and by Ms. Laroche regarding the French market).

Vynnychenko's promotion of *Soniachna mashyna* in the West was also designed to make the novel a "calling card" for Ukrainian literature. However, his personal ambitions became a stumbling block and the immense three-volume novel scared off publishers. The poor translation (into German) was another factor that worked against the novel, which was distinguished by its masterfully elaborate language and style.

What was Vynnychenko's fate as a displaced writer after 1925 when he moved to France? The German economic crisis coincided with the Soviet government's policy of indigenization (*korenizatsiia*) and economic and political liberalization, both of which had positive effects on Ukrainian national culture. For a while Vynnychenko sought reconciliation with the regime and even considered going home. The Soviet leaders, however, were afraid of his influence on Ukrainian political life and preferred to keep him at bay. On the one hand, Vynnychenko was vilified in the central press as an "agent of bourgeois states" (Volin); on the other hand, his plays were performed widely in theatres and his works were allowed to be published. In the 1920s he remained one of the most popular writers in the homeland (i.e., his works in 25 volumes appeared simultaneously in two of the largest publishing houses, "Rukh" and DVU, and the novel *Soniachna mashyna* was released in five editions during 1928-1930). He became a member of various artistic organizations (e.g., Association of Ukrainian Playwrights) and led an active correspondence with Ukrainian writers (e.g., Hryhorii Kosynka and Valerian Pidmohyl'nyi). Royalties received from Ukrainian publishing houses were substantial enough to allow him to live independently and build a house in Paris. Toward the end of the 1920s and in the early 1930s, with Stalin's centralization of power, his works fell victim to censorship: he received special "requests" about what to change and write, and he was forbidden to enter Ukraine.

Throughout this time Vynnychenko remained critical of Soviet socialism, considering it tyrannical and totalitarian, even though ideologically he supported the Soviet Union (*Za iaku Ukrainu?* 1934) until the policies of the "Great Terror" in the 1930s. For some time he was not even certain that a horrible famine had occurred in Ukraine in 1932-33 during the Stalinist collectivization, which claimed between 7 and 10 million lives. He was also quite unhappy in Europe. As a true Marxist, Vynnychenko considered capitalism historically doomed, believing it would give way to a socialist and communist society, and he adhered to the views of those intellectuals who envisaged "the decline of the West." Also, his relationships within the Ukrainian diaspora remained very strained, as he continued to express Marxist views and maintain contacts and expressed sentiments for the Soviet state. This ambiguous love-hate relationship, feelings of betrayal and reconciliation, and uncertainty about the future deepened Vynnychenko's dividedness and suspension between homeland and hostland. This is how Vynnychenko metaphorically describes his state:

> Я часом здаюся сам собі подібним до людини, що впала на дно моря і живе там у чужому світі. Часом їй вдається на мить вигринути, щось гукнути на той світ, що покинула, помітити там якісь бульки від свого гуку і знову пірнути на дно,—і знову зникає той покинутий світ, і знову боротьба всередині себе за почування себе собою, за творення життя навіть у підводній країні (*Shchodennyk*, 5 August 1928).

> Sometimes I resemble someone that has fallen to the bottom of the sea and lives there in a foreign world. Sometimes he manages to rise to the surface for a moment, shout something to that the world that he abandoned, observe the bubbles created by his shouts and then he dives down to the bottom again. And once again that abandoned world disappears and once again there is an inner struggle to be oneself and to create life if even in an underwater country.

Vynnychenko's search for new themes also revealed his ambiguity. While the play *Velykyi sekret* (1925), which contains elements of farce and surrealism, was in step with French theatrical demands, the play *Nad* (1928) takes us back to the moral problems of his earlier works and reflects on post-revolutionary Ukraine. The "socio-detective" novel about émigré life, *Poklady zolota* (1927), which also contains exilic features, masterfully reveals his state of ambiguity: the main protagonist hesitates between returning home and staying in the hostland. Vynnychenko's nostalgia is especially evident in his six children's stories for the collection *Namysto* written during 1928-29. His play *Prorok* (1929) sums up his period of enormous hesitation and ambiguity between his homeland and hostland in the 1920s and signals his return towards broad international problems, ideological quests, and foreign settings—all that he initiated in *Soniachna mashyna*.

With time, Vynnychenko began experiencing difficulties with understanding the changes in the political, social, and cultural life of his homeland. Although he followed life in the Soviet Union through periodicals, correspondence, and reports by eye-witnesses, this seemed to be insufficient for a writer's sensibility. This inevitably engendered a psychological feeling of otherness and alienation. Despite the success of *Soniachna mashyna* in Ukraine, Vynnychenko was increasingly perceived as a writer of the old generation who was not quite in step with post-revolutionary reality. His alienation grew when his recently published works (i.e. *Pisnia Izrailia*, *Nad*, *Soniachna mashyna*) were strenuously criticized by the party, and other works (i.e., *Poklady zolota*, *Prorok*, *Shchastia* (1928-30) and *Nova zapovid'* (1930-32)) were rejected by the censors. From 1932 his writings were totally proscribed and removed from libraries until 1987. In 1933 he stopped receiving royalty payments and in 1934, to survive, he moved to the village of Mougins in the South of France.

Although Vynnychenko had long dreamed of making his Paris house into a cultural hub of the world, he was soon irritated by the noisy and hectic life of "bourgeois Paris." Consequently, he began seeking tranquility and isolation, which he indeed found in long trips to the South of France, or by living on a nudist island near Paris or by practicing vegetarianism and a simple way of life. Thus, his move to the village of Mougins (near Cannes) was a logical destination, transforming the writer into a virtual hermit, isolated from the outside world but actively meditating on its development and actively seeking ways to rebuild it according to his own ideas. Opposed to Western capitalism and disillusioned by Soviet socialism, he became interested in Eastern philosophy. The contemporary world, in his opinion, looked like a huge leprosarium with lepers as its inhabitants. No social revolutions could alter the world without inner change, which must regenerate individuals to live in harmony with each other and the outer world.

Cut off from his native literature, Vynnychenko tried to integrate himself into the hostland discourse. In 1931 the writer commented on the refusal to publish his new work *Shchastia* in the homeland and concluded that it was forcing him "to join a foreign literature as I'm being pushed out of Ukrainian literature" (*Shchodennyk*, 18 May). With his two novels, *Vichnyi imperatyv* (1936) and *Leprozorii* (1938), he took part in literary competitions, hoping to present interesting and original ideas, and even dreamed of representing France in an international competition: "…The French would be silly if they didn't allow *Vichnyi imperatyv* to represent France in the international competition. It possesses something that would draw the attention of the whole world" (ibid., 15 April 1936). After the failure of *Vichnyi imperatyv* Vynnychenko resorted to a mystification by ascribing the authorship of *Leprozorii* to a female writer, Yvonne Volven. He began actively arranging for translations of his works. For many of them (e.g., *Prorok*, *Shchastia*, *Vichnyi imperatyv*, *Leprozorii*, *Nova zapovid'* and *Slovo za toboiu, Staline* (1950)) the writer deliberately chose a foreign setting (Germany, France, USA and India), addressing a number of international problems that in theory could be of interest and stimulate French and other European readers: the relationship between the individual and the collective in the age of "the revolt of masses"; the denunciation of totalitarian regimes in Europe (e.g., in Germany, Italy, the USSR), the complex relationship among different social classes; the dependent and destabilizing role of European Communist parties ruled from the Moscow centre that undermined their own societies; polemics about the development of communism and Marxism. With his novels, *Vichnyi imperatyv* and *Leprozorii*, he was one of the first, along with André Gide (*Retour de l'U.R.S.S.*, 1936) and Arthur Koestler (*Darkness at Noon*, 1940) to open the world's eyes to the real mechanism of totalitarian power in the Soviet state. However, his voice was barely heard in a situation of colonial prejudice and political reaction, which existed in Europe in the 1930-40s.

Vynnychenko's shift to more universal themes continued to be conditioned by his Marxist ideological stance, which implied the brotherhood of all working people and abolition of state borders. His departure from the homeland, superficial understanding of the hostland society, and his isolation forced him to live more and more in the world of ideas, which to a large extent explains the rise and dominance of doctrinaire tendencies in his aesthetic. The play *Prorok* is the last work in which we see a clash of ideas and a critical attitude toward the concept of absolute truth. His next works (i.e., *Vichnyi imperatyv*, *Leprozorii*, *Nova zapovid'* and *Slovo za toboiu, Staline*) may be considered illustrative of his new philosophy of concordism, a system of happiness (Lashchyk). This philosophy was systematically developed in two philosophical treaties, *Shchastia* and *Konkordyzm* (1938-1948). Vynnychenko considered the latter work his "favourite child," to which he became extremely partial. However, his attempts to spread his new teachings did not find any recognition and failed because of its rather utopian and doctrinaire character (e.g., the building of a perfect society, rejection of religion, vegetarianism, etc).

Vynnychenko's broad international and philosophical preoccupations do not mean that he abandoned his homeland. He always carried within him a sense of mission, and he constantly sought to make his works not simply exotic but representative of Ukraine in the European discourse. Although this was difficult to do because of the colonial preconceptions of the hostland, the writer always protested against being a colonized subject. With the rise of fascism in Europe, Vynnychenko became involved in projects concerning world peace and the role that Ukraine might play in that process (i.e., *Pered novym etapom*, 1938). He published a number of journalistic articles in the 1930s-40s in the diaspora press.[1] None of his fiction, however, was published during the period 1933-1948. After the war the emergence of a new wave of Ukrainian displaced persons helped revive his reputation as a writer, leading to the publication of his works and collaboration with the Ukrainian press. The postwar situation also stirred Western interest in Eastern Europe. His revised novel *Nova zapovid'* (1949)[2] appeared in French translation and contributed to a discussion about world developments. Only in his last work, *Slovo za toboiu, Staline*, does Vynnychenko make an imaginary return trip home, remaining simultaneously a citizen of the world who is concerned above all with world peace and the building of a new postwar order.

---

[1] "Odkrytyi lyst do Stalina i chleniv Politbiura VKP" [An Open Letter to Stalin and Members of the Political Bureau of the VKP] (1935), "Meta i zasoby" [The Goal and the Means] (1936), "Plebistsyt na Ukraini" [Plebiscite in Ukraine] (1938), "Za derzhavnu voliu Ukrainy" [For Ukraine's State Freedom] (1940), to mention just a few.

[2] Winnitschenko, W. 1949. *Nouveau Commendement*. Paris: Editions des Presses u Temps Present.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Meyer Howard. 1988. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Montreal, Toronto, London, Sydney, Tokyo: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 5th edition.

Almanakh TURFDim v Kanadi i bratnikh orhanizatsii, 1918-1929 [Almanac of the Ukrainian Labour-Farmer Temple Association and Fraternal Organizations]. [Winnipeg]. 1930.

Anderson, Amanda. 2001. *The Powers of Distance. Cosmopolitanism and the Cultivation of Detachment.* Princeton and Oxford: Princeton UP.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London [England]: Verso Editions/NLB.

"Artystychni zamitky" [Artistic Notes] (Author unknown). 1911. *Dilo* 29 (8 February): 7.

"Askeladden and his Good Helpers" (Norwegian folk tale). http://www.testmann.gs.nt.no/facts/nor05.htm [13 April 2005].

Bammer, Angelika. "Introduction." 1994. In *Displacements: Cultural Identities in Question*. Ed. Angelika Bammer, pp. xi-xx. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP.

Baran, Halyna. 1997. "Utopiia i antyutopiia iak zhanry" [Utopia and Anti-Utopia as Genres]. *Slovo i chas* 7: 47-51.

Baranczak, Stanislaw. 1994. "Tongue-Tied Eloquence: Notes on Language, Exile, and Writing." In *Altogether elsewhere. Writers on Exile*. Ed. Marc Robinson, pp. 246-251. San Diego, New York, London: A Harvest Book, Harcourt Brace & Company.

Bazhynov, I. 1962. "Burzhuazna tsyvilizatsiia pered sudom Bunina" [Bourgeois Civilization is Accussed by Bunin]. *Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo* 2: 72-82.

Beja, Morris. 1992. *James Joyce. A Literary Life*. Columbus: Ohio State UP.

Bilets'kyi, Oleksandr. 1990. "*Soniachna mashyna* Volodymyra Vynnychenka" [Vynnychenko's *Soniachna mashyna*]. In his *Literaturno-krytychni statti*, pp. 121-131. Kyiv: Dnipro.

Bloch, Ernst. 1995. *The principle of Hope*. Trans. Neville Plaice, Stephen Plaice, and Paul Knight, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Bloom, Harold. 1973. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford UP.

Bogdanov, Aleksandr. 1979. *Krasnaia zvezda. Inzhener Menni* [Red Star. An Engineer Menni]. Hamburg: Buske.

Boym, Svetlana. 2001. *The Future of Nostalgia*. Basic Books.

Bradbury, Malcolm and James McFarlane. 1991. "The Name and Nature of Modernism." In *Modernism. A Guide to European Literature. 1890-1930*. Eds. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, pp. 19-55. Penguin Books.

Bradbury, Malcolm. 1991. "The Cities of Modernism." In *Modernism. A Guide to European Literature. 1890-1930*. Eds. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, pp. 96-104. Penguin Books.

Brandes, George. 1906. *Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature*. 6 vols. Vol. 1. The Emigrant Literature. New York: The Macmillan Company, London: William Heinemann.

Bratus', O. 2001. "Volodymyr Vynnychenko iak dytiachyi pys'mennyk" [Volodymyr Vynnychenko as the Children Writer]. *Literaturoznavchi studii*. Ed. M. Naienko et al., pp. 36-40. Kyiv: Kyivs'kyi universytet.

Buechner, Frederick. 1996. *The Longing for Home. Recollections and Reflections*. HarperSanFrancisco.

Bullock, Alan. 1991. "The Double Image." In *Modernism. A Guide to European Literature. 1890-1930*. Eds. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, pp. 58-70. Penguin Books.

Bürger, Peter. 1984. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Trans. Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: UP.

Cahm, Eric. 1991. "Revolt, Conservatism and Raection in Paris, 1905-25." In *Modernism. A Guide to European Literature. 1890-1930*. Eds. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, pp. 162-171. Penguin Books.

Chaplenko, Vasyl. 1984. "Mystets'ka kharakterystyka 'Soniachnoii mashyny'" [Artistic Assessment of 'The Solar Machine']. In his *Z istorii ukrains'koho pys'menstva*, pp. 87-96. New York.

Chow, Rey. 1993. *Writing Diaspora. Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP.

Chykalenko, Ievhen. 1931. *Shchodennyk (1907-1917)* [Diary (1907-1917)]. L'viv: Chervona kalyna.

————. 1955. *Spohady (1861-1907)* [Memoirs (1861-1907)]. New York: UVAN.

Clifford, James. 1994. "Diasporas" *Cultural Anthropology* 3: 302-338.

Clift, Dalby and Wallace Clift. 1996. *The Archetype of Pilgrimage: Outer Action with Inner Meaning*. New York, Mahwah N.J.: Paulist Press.

Cohen, Robin. 1997. *Global Diasporas. An Introduction*. Seattle: U of Washington P.

"Cossack Mamaryha" (Ukrainian folk tale). http://www.4to40.com/folktales/index.asp?article=folktales_cossackmamariha [13 April 2005].

Cowley, Malcolm. 1956. *Exile's Return. A Literary Odyssey of the 1920s*. New York: The Viking Press.

Culler, Jonathan. 1975. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics, and the Study of Literature*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Dahlie, Hallvard. 1986. *Varieties of Exile. The Canadian Experience*. Vancouver: U of British Columbia P.

Davis, Fred. 1979. *Yearning for Yesterday. A Sociology of Nostalgia*. New York: The Free Press and London: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Félix. 1986. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. U of Minnesota P.

Di Marco, Domenico A. 1984-1985. "A Note on Emma Gramatica and Volodymyr Vynnychenko." *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US. Studies in Ukrainian Literature*. Ed. Bohdan Rubchak. Vol. XVI, 41-42: 377-382.

Dorochenkov, Askold. 2001. *Emigratsiia 'pervoi volny' o natsional'nykh problemakh i sud'be Rossii* [Émigrés of the 'First Wave' About National Problems and the Fate of Russia]. Sankt-Peterburg: DB.

Doroshkevych, Oleksandr. 1927. *Pidruchnyk istorii ukrains'koii literatury* [Textbook of History of Ukrainian Literature]. Knyhospilka.

Dube, Wolf-Dieter. "The Expressionist Dream." http://www.palazzograssi.it/eng/mostre/espressionismo/intro/sogno.htm [13 April 2005].

Dyer, Richard. 2000. "Entertainment and Utopia." *The Cultural Reader*. Ed. Simon During, pp. 371-81. London and New York: Routledge.

Eagleton, Terry. 1970. *Exiles and Émigrés. Studies in Modern Literature*. New York: Schocken Books.

Earnest, Ernest. 1968. *Expatriates and Patriots. American Artists, Scholars and Writers in Europe*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke UP.

Edwards, Robert. 1988. "Exile, Self, and Society." In *Exile in Literature*. Eds. Lagos-Pope María-Inés, pp. 15-31. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, London and Toronto: Associated UP.

Ehre, Milton. 1991. "Olesha's Zavist': Utopia and Dystopia." *Slavic Review*. Vol. 50. 3: 601-611.

Ely, Christopher. 2002. *This Meager Nature: Landscape and National Identity in Imperial Russia*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP.

Fedchenko, Pavlo. 1987. "Otsiniuiemo z klasovykh pozytsii" [We Evaluate from Class Positions]. *Kyiv* 12: 49-59.

————. 1989. "Sotsial'na fantastyka Volodymyra Vynnychenka" [Volodymyr Vynnychenko's Social Science Fiction]. In Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. *Soniachna mashyna*, pp. 611-618. Kyiv: Dnipro.

Fedoruk, Oleksandr. 2002. "Vynnychenko—khudozhnyk 'Ekol de Pari'" [Vynnychenko—an Artist of the 'Ekol de Pari']. *Slovo i chas* 2: 76-82.

Ferns, Chris. 1999. *Narrating Utopia. Ideology, Gender, Form in Utopian Literature*. Liverpool UP.

Fish, Stanley. 1980. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.

Fizer, Ivan. 1969. "Vstupna stattia" [Introductory Note]. In *Koordynaty. Antolohiia suchasnoii ukrains'koi poezii na zakhodi*. Eds. Bohdan Boichuk and Bohdan T. Rubchak, pp. xiii-xxxii. Suchasnist'.

Franko, Ivan. 1976. "Internatsionalism ta natsionalizm u suchasnykh literaturakh" [Internationalism and Nationalism in Contemporary Literatures]. In his *Zibrannia tvoriv u 50 tomakh*. Vol. 31, pp. 91-101. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

————. 1982. "Stare i nove v suchasnii ukrains'kii literature" [Old and New in Contemporary Ukrainian Literature]. In his *Zibrannia tvoriv u 50 tomakh.* Vol. 35, pp. 91-101. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

Frye, Northrop. 1967. "Varieties of Literary Utopias." In *Utopias and Utopian Thought*. Ed. Frank E. Manuel, pp. 260-280. Boston: Beacon.

Glad, John, ed. 1993. *Conversations in Exile. Russian Writers Abroad*. Durham and London: Duke UP.

Gide, André. 1937. *Back from the USSR*. London: Martin Secker and Warburg Ltd.

Gorky, Maxim. 1953. "O 'karamazovshchine'" [About 'Karamazovshchina']. In his *Sobraniie sochinenii v 30 tomakh*. Vol. 24, pp. 146-150. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoie izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury.

————. 1955. "Pis'mo k V. Miroliubovu" [A Letter to V. Miroliubov]. *Sobraniie sochinenii v 30 tomakh*. Vol. 29, pp. 177-178. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoie izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury.

————. 2000. *Pis'ma* [Letters]. Vol. 6 (1907-August 1908). Moskva: Nauka.

————. 2001. *Pis'ma* [Letters]. Vol. 7 (August 1908-1909). Moskva: Nauka.

Guillén, Claudio. 1976. "On the Literature of Exile and Counter-Exile." *Books Abroad. An International Literary Quarterly* 50: 271-280.

Gurko, Leo. 1962. *Joseph Conrad: Giant in Exile*. New York: Macmillan.

Gurr, Andrew. 1981. *Writers in Exile. The Identity of Home in Modern Literature*. Sussex: The Harvester Press and New Jersey: Humanities Press.

Halahan, Mykola. 1930. *Z moikh spomyniv* [From my Memoirs]. 4 vols. Vol. 1. L'viv: Chervona kalyna.

Hall, Stuart. 1990. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford, pp. 222-237. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hallivell, Martin. 2002. "The Blind Impress of Modernity: American Exile and Modernist Aesthetics in Lorca and Kafka." In *Displaced Persons: Conditions of Exile in European Culture*. Ed. Ouditt, Sharon, pp. 102-114. Ashgate.

Hekhter, M. 1908. "Novyny nashoii literatury. "Dzvin." Zbirnyk 1" [News of Our Literature. "Dzvin." Collection 1]. *Rada* 19 (5 February): 1-2; 20 (6 February): 2-3.

Hnidan, O., Demianivs'ka, L. 1996. *Volodymyr Vynnychenko. Zhyttia, diial'nist', tvorchist'* [Volodymyr Vynnychenko. Life, Activity, Writing]. Kyiv.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1991. "Exile." *Social Research. An International Quarterly of the Social Sciences*. Vol. 58, 1: 65-68.

Hoffman, Eva. 1989. *Lost in Translation: A Life in a New Language*. New York: E.P. Dutton.

Hoffmeister, Adolph. 1979. "Portrait of Joyce." In *Portraits of the Artists in Exile. Recollections of James Joyce by Europeans*. Ed. Potts, Willard, pp. 127-36. Seattle and London: U of Washington P.

Holland, Norman. 1975. *The Dynamics of Literary Response*. New York: Norton.

Holman, C. Hugh and Harman, William. 1992. *A Handbook to Literature*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company; Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan Canada; New York, Oxford, Singapore, Sydney: Maxwell Macmillan International. 6th edition.

Horban', A. 2001. "Svitohliadni modeli u zbirtsi V. Vynnychenka 'Namysto'" [Models of World Outlook in V. Vynnychenko's Collection 'Namysto']. *Literaturoznavchi studii*. Eds. M. Naienko et al., pp. 76-81. Kyiv: Kyivs'kyi universytet.

Hordyns'kyi, Sviatoslav. 1953. "Maliarski tvory V. Vynnychenka" [Vynnychenko's Paintings]. In *Volodymyr Vynnychenko. Statti i materiialy*, pp. 57-60. New York.

Hozhyk, Oleksandr. 1999. "Metamorfozy utopichnykh spodivan': *Na toi bik* V. Vynnychenka" [Metamorphoses of Utopian Expectations: Vynnychenko's *Na toi bik*]. *Slovo i chas* 3: 71-76.

Hrechaniuk, Serhii. 1990. "Volodymyr Vynnychenko: doba i dolia" [Volodymyr Vynnychenko: Time and Fate]. In his *Na tli XX stolittia. Literaturno-krytychni narysy*, pp. 187-242. Kyiv: Radians'kyi pys'mennyk.

Hrushevs'kyi, Oleksandr. 1918. "Z ostannikh opovidan' Vynnychenka" [From Recent Stories by Vynnychenko]. *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* 2-3: 240-248.

Hundorova, Tamara. 1997. *Proiavlennia slova: dyskursiia rannioho ukrains'koho modernizmu* [Manifestation of a Word: The Discourse of Early Ukrainian Modernism]. L'viv: Tsentr humanitarnykh doslidzhen' L'vivskoho derzhavnoho universytetu,.

Huxley, Aldous. 1932. *Brave New World*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Iefremov, Serhii. 1908. "Literaturnyi namul" [Literary Slime]. *Rada*, 45 (7 March): 2-3; 46 (8 March): 2; 48 (11 March): 2-3; 49 (12 March): 2-3; 51 (14 March): 1-3; 53 (17 March): 2-3.

————. 1919. *Istoriia ukrain'skoho pys'menstva* [History of Ukrainian Literature]. Vol. 2. Kyiv-Leipzig, Kolomyia, Winnipeg.

———. 1993. "V poiskakh novoi krasoty" [In a Search for New Beauty]. *Literaturno-krytychni statti*, pp. 48-121. Kyiv: Dnipro.

———. 1997. *Shchodennyky, 1923-1929* [Diaries, 1923-1929]. Kyiv: Hazeta "Rada."

"Ievanheliie vid Sv. Luky" [The Gospel According to Luke], 14: 26. http://www.ukrlc.org/bible/new/4_Jevangelie/Luke.htm [13 April 2005].

Ievshan, Mykola. 1998a. "Suchasna pol's'ka literatura i ii vplyv na nashu" [Contemporary Polish Literature and its Influence on Our Literature]. In his *Krytyka. Literaturoznavstvo. Estetyka*, Ed. Nataliia Shumylo, pp. 307-313. Kyiv: Osnovy. First printed in *LNV* 60 (1912): 526-534.

———. 1998b "'Supreme lex.' Slovo pro kul'turu ukrains'koho slova" ['Supreme Lex.' A Word About Culture of Ukrainian Word]. In his *Krytyka. Literaturoznavstvo. Estetyka*. Ed. Nataliia Shumylo, pp. 58-64. Kyiv: Osnovy. First printed in *Ukrains'ka khata* 3-4 (1914): 268-77.

———. 1998c. "V. Vynnychenko. Na vesakh zhizni. Roman. Sbornik "Zemlia". Vol. IX. (Moscow, 1912) [V. Vynnychenko. Equilibrium. A Novel. Collection "Zemlia." Vol. IX (Moscow, 1912)]. In his *Krytyka. Literaturoznavstvo. Estetyka*. Ed. Nataliia Shumylo, pp. 573-575. Kyiv: Osnovy. [First printed in *Ukrains'ka khata*, 9-10 (1912): 550-553].

Ilie, Paul. 1980. *Literature and Inner Exile. Authoritarian Spain, 1939-1975*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins UP.

Il'nyts'kyi, Mykola. 1995. "Poeziia smutku" [Poetry of Sadness]. In Karmans'kyi, Petro. *Dorohamy smutku i zmahan'*, pp. 3-22. L'viv: Kameniar.

Ilnytzkyj, Oleh S. 1991. "The Modernist Ideology and Mykola Khvyl'ovyi." Harvard *Ukrainian Studies*. Vol. XV 3/4 (December): 257-262.

———. 1997. *Ukrainian Futurism, 1914-1930. A Historical and Critical Study*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Distributed by Harvard UP for the Ukrainian Research Institute, Harvard University.

———. 2002. "Italy in the Works of Petro Karmansky." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 27 (1/2) Summer-Winter: 79-91.

———. 2003. "Modeling Culture in the Empire: Ukrainian Modernism and the Death of the All-Russian Idea." In *Culture, Nation, and Identity. The Ukrainian-Russian Encounter (1600-1945)*. Eds. Andreas Kappeler, Zenon E. Kohut, Frank E. Sysyn, and Mark von Hagen, pp.298-324. Edmonton and Toronto: CIUS Press.

Isajiv, Wsevolod W., Yury Boshyk and Roman Senkus, eds. 1992. *The Refugee Experience: Ukrainian Displaced Persons after World War II*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

Iser, Wolfgang. 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

Jacoby, Mario. 1985. *The Longing for Paradise. Psychological Perspectives on an Archetype*. Boston: Sigo Press.

Jauss, Hans Robert. 1982. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Trans. from German by Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.

Jentsch-Grooms, Lynda. 1983. *Exile and the Process of Individuation*. Valencia: Albatros ediciones.

Joyce, James. 1959. *The Critical Writings of James Joyce*. Eds. Ellsworth Mason and Richard Ellmann. New York: Viking.

Kaczurowskyj, Igor. 1973. "Eskapizm iak literaturne iavyshche" [Escapism as a Literary Phenomenon]. *Vyzvol'nyi shliakh* [London] 10: 1099-1111.

————. 2002. "Strykhy do portreta velykoho maistra. Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho prozova tvorchist'" [Towards a Portrait of a Great Master. Volodymyr Vynnychenko and His Prose]. In his *Promenysti Syl'vety. Lektsii, dopovidi, statti, eseii, rozvidky*, pp. 124-67. München.

Kaes, Anton, 2004. "Cinema and Expressionism." In *A New History of German Literature*. Ed. David E. Wellbery, pp. 718-723. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP.

Kaplan, Caren. 1996. *Questions of Travel. Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*. Durham and London: Duke UP.

Karmans'kyi, Petro. 1996. *Ukrains'ka Bohema* [Ukrainian Bohemia]. L'viv: Olir. 2nd edition.

Kasianov, Heorhii. 1993. *Ukrains'ka intelihentsiia na rubezhi XIX-XX stolit'* [Ukrainian Intelligentsia at the Turn of the 19-20th Centuries]. Kyiv: Lybid'.

Kaspryk, Andrew. 2000. *Volodymyr Vynnychenko's Nietzschean Revolutionary Hero*. PhD Thesis, U of Illinois at Chicago.

Kern, Gary. 1988. "Introduction. The Ultimate Anti-Utopia." In *Zamyatin's We. A Collection of Critical Essay*. Ed. Gary Kern. Ann Arbor: Ardis.

Kharkhun, Valentyna. 1998. "Heroi-eksperymentator u V. Vynnychenka" [V. Vynnychenko's Hero-Experimenter]. *Slovo i chas* 11: 62-66.

Khorob, Stepan. 2002. *Ukrains'ka moderna drama kintsia XIX—pochatku XX stolittia: neoromantyzm, symvolizm, ekspresionizm* [Ukrainian Modern Drama at the End of the Nineteenth-at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century: Neo-Romanticism. Symbolism. Expressionism]. Ivano-Frankivs'k: Plai.

Khrystiuk, Pavlo. 1913. "V. Vynnychenko i F. Nietsche" [V. Vynnychenko and F. Nietzsche]. *Ukrains'ka khata* 5: 275-99.

————. 1929. *Pys'mennyts'ka tvorchist' Vynnychenka. Sproba sotsiolohichnoi analizy* [The Writings of V. Vynnychenko. An Attempt of Sociological Analysis]. Kharkiv: Rukh.

Kiriak, Illia. 1939. *Syny zemli* [Sons of the Soil]. Vol. 1. Edmonton. (1940, Vol. 2; 1945, Vol. 3).

————. 1959. *Sons of the Soil*. Ryerson Press.

Knapp, Bettina L. 1991. *Exile and the Writer. Exoteric and Esoteric Experiences. A Jungian Approach.* University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State UP.

Koestler, Arthur. 1961. *Darkness at Noon*. London: Jonathan Cape, Thirty Bedford Square.

Korniienko, Nelli. 1998. *Les' Kurbas: repetytsiia maibutn'oho* [Les' Kurbas: Rehearsal of the Future]. Kyiv: Fact.

Kosach-Kryvyniuk, Ol'ha. 1970. *Lesia Ukrainka: khronolohiia zhyttia i tvorchosti* [Lesia Ukrainka: Chronology of Life and Works]. New York: UVAN.

Kostiuk, Hryhorii. 1980a. *Volodymyr Vynnychenko ta ioho doba* [Volodymyr Vynnychenko and His Epoch]. New York.

————. 1980b. "Zapysnyky Volodymyra Vynnychenka" [Notebooks of Volodymyr Vynnychenko]. In *Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. Shchodennyk*. Vol. 1, pp. 11-28. Edmonton-New-York: Vydavnytstvo KIUS.

Koval', Roman. "Oleksandr Koshyts' i Kuban'" [Oleksandr Koshyts' and Kuban']. (http://www.ukrlife.org/main/kubann/1koshitc.htm [13 April 2005].

Koval', Valentyn. "Heneral P. Skoropads'kyi i ukrains'ke viis'ko [General P. Skoropads'kyi and the Ukrainian Army]. http://uarmy.com.ua/ALMANAH/ALMANAH02/article05/art5.html [30 June 2005].

Kovalyk, Maryna. 2004. "Riznymy shliakhamy do krasy (ishche dvi nedrukovani piesy V. Vynnychenka)" [On Different Paths to Beauty (Two More Unpublished Plays by V. Vynnychenko's]. *Slovo i Chas* 11: 79-81.

Koznarsky, Taras. 1994. *Utopia i antyutopiia v romani V. Vynnychenka "Soniachna mashyna"* [Utopia and Antiutopia in a Novel by V. Vynnychenko *Sun Machine*]. (MA Thesis, University of Alberta).

Krat, Pavlo. 1918. *Koly ziishlo sontse. Opovidanie z 2000 roku* [When the Sun Rose. A Story from 2000]. Toronto: Robitnyche slovo.

Kravchenko, Andrii. 1991. "Zhurnal'na krytyka 20-kh rokiv: tendentsii metodolohii" [Journals' Criticism in the 1920s: Trends of Methodology]. In *20-i roky: literaturni dyskusii, polemiky*. Ed. V. H. Donchyk, pp. 171-211. Kyiv: Dnipro.

Kravchuk, Petro, ed. 1981. *Nasha stsena* [Our Stage]. Toronto: Kobzar.

Krutikova, Nina. 2005. "Vazhlyvyi epistoliarii. Nadiia Myronets'—"Istoriia nasha se borot'ba za natsional'ne isnuvannia". Lystuvannia Ie. Kh. Chykalenka z V. K. Vynnychenkom" [An Important Correspondence. Nadiia Myronets'—"Our History is a Struggle for National Existence." Ie. Kh. Chykalenko's Correspondence with V. K. Vynnychenko]. *Slovo i chas* 1: 77-81.

Kudriavtsev, Mykhailo. 1998. "Ideinyi spektr Vynnychenkovoi dramy *Prorok*" [Ideological Spectrum of Vynnychenko's Drama *Prorok*]. *Slovo i chas* 12: 56-59.

Kumar, Krishan. 1987. *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times*. Basil Blackwell.

Kurbas, Les'. 1988. *Berezil': iz tvorchoi spadshchyny* [Berezil': From Creative Legacy]. Kyiv: Dnipro.

Lagos-Pope, María-Inés. 1988. "Introduction." In *Exile in Literature*. Ed. María-Inés Lagos-Pope, pp. 7-13. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, London and Toronto: Associated UP.

Lakyza, Ivan. 1928. "Pro novyi roman Vol. Vynnychenka *Soniachna mashyna*" [About New Vol. Vynnychenko's Novel *Soniachna mashyna*]. *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia* 4: 99-109.

Landesman, M. Ia. 1972. *Tak pochynalosia kino* [This is How Cinema Began]. Kyiv: Mystetstvo.

Lanovyk, B., ed. 1997. *Istoriia ukrains'koii emihratsii* [History of Ukrainian Emigration]. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola.

Lashchyk, Eugene. 1984-1985. "Vynnyčenko's Philosophy of Happiness." *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US. Studies in Ukrainian Literature*. Ed Bohdan Rubchak. Vol. XVI, 41-42: 289-326.

Lenin, Vladimir. 1964a. "Pis'mo k Inesse Armand" [Letter to Inessa Armand]. In Lenin, Vladimir. *Polnoie sobraniie sochinenii*. Vol. 48, pp. 285-86. Moskva: Politizdat.

————. 1964b. "Pis'mo k Inesse Armand" [Letter to Inessa Armand]. In Lenin, Vladimir. *Polnoie sobraniie sochinenii*. Vol. 48, pp. 294-95. Moskva: Politizdat.

Leshko, Jaroslaw. 2005. *Alexander Archipenko: Vision and Continuity*. New York: The Ukrainian Museum.

Levin, Harry. 1966. "Literature and Exile." In his *Refractions in Comparative Literature*, pp. 62-81. New York.

Livak, Leonid. 2003. *How It was Done in Paris. Russian Émigré Literature and French Modernism*. U of Wisconsin P.

Luckyj, George. 1990. *Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934*. Duke UP.

Lunacharskii, Anatolii. 1908-11. *Religiia i sotsializm* [Religion and Socialism]. St. Petersburg.

Luts'kyi, Ostap. 1968. "Moloda muza" [Young Muse]. In *Ostap Luts'kyi—molodomuzets.'* Ed. Iurii Luts'kyi, pp. 155-159. New York: Slovo.

Lysiak-Rudnytsky, Ivan. 1980. "Suspil'no-politychnyi svitohliad Volodymyra Vynnychenka u svitli ioho publitsystychnykh pysan'" [Volodymyr Vynnychenko's Ideas in the Light of His Political Writings]. *Suchasnist'* 9: 60-77.

"Lystuvannia M. Kotsiubyns'koho z V. Vynnychenkom" [M. Kotsiubyns'kyi's Correspondence with V. Vynnychenko]. 1988. *Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo* 2: 37-60.

"Lysty do Volodymyra Vynnychenka" [Letters to Volodymyr Vynnychenko]. 1964. *Slovo*. Zbirnyk 2, pp. 317-335. New York: Slovo.

Makaryk, Irene. 2004. *Shakespeare in the Undiscovered Bourn: Les Kurbas, Ukrainian Modernism, and Early Soviet Cultural Politics*. U of Toronto P.

Malaniuk, Ievhan. 1923. *Pro domo sua*. Kyiv: Veselka.

Mandryka, Mykyta. 1968. *History of Ukrainian literature in Canada*. Winnipeg, Ottawa, Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences.

Mannheim, Karl. 1936. *Ideology and Utopia: an Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. Trans. from the German by Louis Wirth and Edward Shils. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Marshall, Gordon, ed. 1998. *A Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford UP. 2nd edition.

Maznyi, Volodymyr. 2002-2003. *Lysty do Mykhaila Kotsiubyns'koho* [Letters to Mykhailo Kotsiubyns'kyi]. 4 vols. Vol. 1. Kyiv: Ukrains'ki propileii.

McFarlane, James. "The Mind of Modernism." In *Modernism. A Guide to European Literature. 1890-1930*. Eds. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane. pp. 71-93. Penguin Books.

Milbauer, Asher Z. 1985. *Transcending Exile: Conrad, Nabokov, I.B. Singer*. Miami: Florida International UP.

Milosz, Czeslaw. 1976. "Notes on Exile." In *Books Abroad. An International Literary Quarterly* 50: 281-284.

Monroe, William. 1998. *Power to Hurt. The Virtues of Alienation*. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P.

Moore, Harry, ed. 1962. *The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Vol. 1. London: Heinemann.

Moroz, Larysa. 1994. *"Sto rivnotsinnykh pravd". Paradoksy dramaturhii V.Vynnychenka*. ["One Hundred Equivalent Truths". Paradoxes of V. Vynnychenko's Drama]. Kyiv.

Morse, Margaret. 1999. "Home: Smell, Taste, Posture, Gleam." In *Home, Exile, Homeland: Film, Media, and the Politics of Place*. Ed. Hamid Naficy, pp. 63-74. New York and London: Routledge.

Motyl, Alexander and Kostiuk, Hryhorii. 1983. "Pro druhyi tom *Shchodennyka*" [About Volume Two of the Diary]. In *Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. Shchodennyk*. Vol. 2, pp. 11-22. Edmonton-New-York: Vydavnytstvo KIUS.

Mumford, Lewis. 1928. *The Story of Utopias*. New York: Boni and Liveright. Fourth printing.

Narizhnyi, Symon. 1942. *Ukrains'ka emihratsiia. Kul'turna pratsia ukrains'koii emihratsii mizh dvoma svitovymy viinamy* [Ukrainian Emigration. Cultural Work of the Ukrainian Emigration Between Two World Wars]. 2 vols. Prague.

Nawas, M. Mike and Jerome J. Platt. 1965. "A Future Oriented Theory of Nostalgia." *Journal of Individual Psychology*. 21 (May): 51-58.

Nechui-Levyts'kyi, Ivan. 1998a. "S'ohochasne literaturne priamuvannia" [Contemporary Literary Directions]. In *Istoriia ukrains'koii literaturnoii krytyky ta literaturoznavstva. Khrestomatiia*. Red. P. Fedchenko. Knyha 2, pp. 212-222. Kyiv: Lybid'.

————. 1998b. "Ukrains'ka dekadentshchyna" [Ukrainian Decadentism]. In *Istoriia ukrains'koii literaturnoii krytyky ta literaturoznavstva. Khrestomatiia*. Red. P. Fedchenko. Knyha 2, pp. 229-237. Kyiv: Lybid'.

Nehodenko, T. 2001. "Moral'no-psycholohichna strukturovanist' dytiachykh opovidan' Vynnychenka" [Moral and Psychological Structuring of Vynnychenko's Children's Stories]. Eds. M. Naienko et al. *Literaturoznavchi studii*, pp. 189-192. Kyiv: Kyivs'kyi universytet.

Niebuhr, Richard R. 1984. "Pilgrims and Pioneers." *Parabola*. Vol. IX, 3: 6-13.

Neijmann, Daisy. 1997. *The Icelandic Voice in Canadian Letters. The Contribution of Icelandic-Canadian Writers to Canadian Literature*. Ottawa: Carleton UP.

Nikovs'kyi, Andrii. 1914. "V.Vynnychenko: Rivnovaha. Roman. V-vo "Dzvin". Tvory, kn. 6, Kyiv" [V.Vynnychenko: Equilibrium. A Novel. Publisher: Dzvin. Works, Book 6, Kyiv]. *Literaturno-naukovyi visnyk* 3: 597-599.

"Novi povisti V. Vynnychenka" [New Stories by V. Vynnychenko] (Author unknown). 1911. *Rada* 1 (14 January): 5.

Ochyns'kyi, Ivan. 1930. "Evoliutsiia tvorchosty Vynnychenka" [The Evolution of Vynnychenko's Writings]. *Zhyttia i revoliutsiia* 7: 133-142.

"Olaf Stefenzon" (Author unknown). 1913. *Ukrains'ka khata* 2: 313-14.

Olgin, Moissaye. 1917. *The Soul of the Russian Revolution*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.

Onyshkevych, Larissa. 1972. "Roboty i antyroboty. *Soniachna mashyna* V. Vynnychenka i *Rur* K. Chapeka" [Robots and Anti-Robots. V. Vynychenko's *Soniachna mashyna* and K. Čapek's *Rur*]. *Suchasnist'* 4: 60-73.

————. 1973. *Existentialism in Modern Ukrainian Drama*. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Ortega y Gasset, Jose. 1985. *The Revolt of the Masses*. Notre Dame, Ind.: U of Notre Dame P.

Owen, Stephen. 1990. "The Anxiety of Global Influence: What is World Poetry?" *The New Republic* (19 November): 28-32.

Panchenko, Volodymyr. 1997a. "Molodi lita Volodymyra Vynnychenka" [Volodymyr Vynnychenko in His Youth]. *Kyiv* 3-4: 143-155.

————. 1997b. “Zaochna duel’. Volodymyr Vynnychenko i Volodymyr Ulianov-Lenin” [A Duel at Proxy. Volodymyr Vynnychenko and Volodymyr Ulianov-Lenin]. *Vitchyzna* 1-2: 105-9.

————. 1998. *Tvorchist’ Volodymyra Vynnychenka 1902—1920 rr. u henetychnykh i typolohichnykh zviazkakh z ievropeis’kymy literaturamy* [Writing of Volodymyr Vynnychenko in 1902—1920 in Its Generic and Typological Relations With European Literatures]. (Doctoral Thesis, Taras Shevchenko Kyiv University). http://www.library.kr.ua/books/panchenko/ [14 April 2005]

————. 2003. *Kapriis’ki siuzhety: “italiis’ka” proza Mykhaila Kotsiubyns’koho i Volodymyra Vynnychenka* [Capri: Experiments and Experimenters]. Uporiadnyk Volodymyr Panchenko. Kyiv: Fakt.

Pashchenko, V. I. and Riahuzova, H. M. 1988. “Ukrains’ko-frantsuz’ki literaturni vzaiemyny” [Ukrainian-French Literary Relationships]. In *Ukrains’ka literatura v zahal’noslovians’komu i svitovomu literaturnomu konteksti*. 5 vols. Eds. Hryhotii Verves et al. Vol. 3. Ed. Tetiana Denysova et al., pp. 155-84. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

Pavlychko, Solomea. 1997. *Dyskurs modernizmu v ukrains’kii literaturi* [Discourse of Modernism in Ukrainian Literature]. Kyiv: Lybid’.

Pavlyshyn, Marko. 1989. “Artist or Moralist? Volodymyr Vynnychenko’s ‘The Solar Machine’.” *Australian Slavonic and East European Studies* 2: 17-33.

Peters, John. 1999. “Exile, Nomadism, and Diaspora. The Stakes of Mobility in the Western Canon.” In *Home, Exile, Homeland. Film, Media, and the Politics of Place*. Ed. Hamid Naficy, pp. 17-41. New York and London: Routledge.

Petliura, Symon. 1979. “Dzvin. Zbirnyk” [Dzvin. Collection]. In his *Statti, lysty, dokumenty* [Articles, Letters, Documents]. Vol. 2, pp. 129-32. New York: UVAN. First printed in *Slovo* (1908, no. 2).

Pevnyi, Bohdan. 1994. “Vynnychenkove maliarstvo: kurioz chy mystetstvo” [Vynnychenko’s Paintings: Curiosity or Art]. *Suchasnist* 9: 127-140.

Pfanner, Helmut F. 1983. *Exile in New York*. Detroit: Wayne State UP.

Plattel, Martin G. 1972. *Utopian and Critical Thinking*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne UP.

Pohorilyi, Semen. 1981. *Neopublikovani romany Volodymyra Vynnychenka* [Unpublished Novels of Volodymyr Vynnychenko]. New York.

Pohrebennyk, Iaroslava. 1988. “Ukrains’ko-nimets’ko-avstriis’ki literaturni zviazky XIX-pochatku XX st.” [Ukrainian-German-Austrian Literary Relationships]. In *Ukrains’ka literatura v zahal’noslovians’komu i svitovomu literaturnomu konteksti*. 5 vols. Eds.

Hryhotii Verves et al. Vol. 3. Ed. Tetiana Denysova et al., pp. 220-76. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

Pope, Randolph. 1988. "Unamuno in Exile." In *Exile in Literature*. Ed. Lagos-Pope María-Inés, pp. 72-81. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, London and Toronto: Associated UP.

Popovych, Myroslav. 2000. "'Ia robliu tak i inakshe robyty ne mozhu…'" [I Take This Way and Can't Take Another Way]. *Slovo i chas* 7: 56-58.

Radulescu, Domnica. 2002. "Theorizing Exile." In *Realm of Exile: Nomadism, Diasporas, and Eastern European Voices*. Ed. Domnica Radulescu, pp. 185-204. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Lexington Books.

Revich, V. "Krasnaia zvezda." http://fandom.rusf.ru/about_fan/revich_2_10.htm [13 April 2005].

Revuts'kyi, Valerian. 1971. "Emihratsiina dramaturhiia V. Vynnychenka" [Émigré Plays of V. Vynnychenko]. *Suchasnist'* 12: 43-52.

Richard, Lionel. 1978. *Phaidon Encyclopedia of Expressionism*. Oxford: Phaidon.

Richter, Peyton E. 1975. "Utopia/Dystopia?: Threats of Hell or Hopes of Paradise." *Utopia/Dystopia?* Ed. Peyton E. Richter, pp. 1-27. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Richyts'kyi, Andrii. 1928. *Vynnychenko v literaturi i politytsi* [Vynnychenko in Literature and Politics]. Kharkiv: DVU.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1986. *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Columbia UP.

Ritivoi, Andreea Deciu. 2002. *Yesterday's Self. Nostalgia and the Immigrant Identity*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Robinson, Marc. 1994. "Introduction." In *Altogether elsewhere. Writers on Exile*. Ed. Marc Robinson, pp. xi-xxii. San Diego, New York, London: A Harvest Book, Harcourt Brace & Company.

Rolland, Romain. 1966. *Mahatma Gandhi*. Paris: Stock.

Ross, Ishbel. 1970. *The Expatriates*. Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Rubchak, Bohdan. 1983. "Homes as Shells: Ukrainian Émigré Poetry." In *The New Soil—Old Roots. The Ukrainian Experience in Canada*. Ed. Jaroslav Rozumnyj, pp. 87-123. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada.

Rudnyts'kyi, Mykhailo. 1936. *Vid Myrnoho do Khvylovoho* [From Myrnyi to Khvylovyi]. L'viv: Dilo.

Rudnytzky, Leonid. 1984-1985. "The Disinherited Dramatist. On the Reception of Vynnychenko's Plays in Germany." *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US. Studies in Ukrainian Literature*. Ed. Bohdan Rubchak. Vol. XVI. 41-42: 361-375.

Rumold, Rainer. 2002. *The Janus Face of the German Avant-Garde. From Expressionism toward Postmodernism*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP.

Ryl's'kyi, Maxim, et. al., eds. 1959. *Ukrains'kyi dramatychnyi teatr. Narysy istorii v dvokh tomakh* [Ukrainian Drama Theatre. Historical Essays in Two Volumes]. Vol. 2. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo AN URSR.

Said, Edward. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf.

————. 1994. "Reflection on Exile." In *Altogether elsewhere. Writers on Exile*. Ed. Marc Robinson, pp. 137-149. San Diego, New York, London: A Harvest Book, Harcourt Brace & Company.

Samantrai, Ranu. 1996. "States of Belonging: Pluralism, Migrancy, Literature." In *Writing ethnicity. Cross-cultural consciousness in Canadian and Quebecois literatur*. Ed. Winfried Siemerling, pp. 33-50. ECW Press.

Samchuk, Ulas. 1967. *Na tverdii zemli* [On Firm Ground]. Roman. Toronto.

Seidel, Michael. 1986. *Exile and the Narrative Imagination*. New Haven and London: Yale UP.

Shabliovs'kyi, Ievhen. 1970. "Pro Volodymyra Vynnychenka" [About Volodymyr Vynnychenko]. *Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo* 8: 40-48.

Shakespeare, William. Romeo and Juliet.
http://www.shakespeare-online.com/plays/romeo_3_3.html [14 April 2005].

Sheppard, Richard. 1991. "German Expressionism." In *Modernism. A Guide to European Literature. 1890-1930*. Eds. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, pp. 274-291. Penguin Books.

Shkandrij, Myroslav. 1992. *Modernists, Marxists and the Nation: the Ukrainian Literary Discussion of the 1920s*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.

————. 2001. *Russia and Ukraine: Literature and the Discourse of Empire from Napoleonic to Postcolonial Times*. McGill-Queen's UP.

Shkoropat, Nadiia. 2000. "H. Kostiuk—arkhivarius literaturno-mystets'koho dorobku V. Vynnychenka" [H. Kostiuk—Archivist of V.Vynnychenko's Literary and Artistic Works]. *Slovo i chas* 7: 53-55.

Shton', Hryhorii. 1994. "Ulas Samchuk" [Ulas Samchuk]. In *Istoriia ukraiins'koii literatury. XX stolittia*. Ed. V. H. Donchyk. Vol. 2, book. 1, pp. 239-44. Kyiv: Lybid'.

Shumylo, Natalia. 1998. "Harmoniine i dysharmoniine v ukrains'kii literaturi pochatku XX st. (Volodymyr Vynnychenko i suchasnyky)" [Harmonious and Disharmoniuos in Ukrainian Literature at the Beginning of the 20th Century (Volodymyr Vynnychenko and Contemporaries)]. *Kyivs'ka starovyna* 5: 124-131.

Shymon, O. 1964. *Storinky z istorii kina na Ukraini* [From History of Cinema in Ukraine]. Kyiv: Mystetstvo.

Smolych, Iurii. 1958. *Z narodom chy proty narodu?* [With People or Against People]. Vydannia komitetu "Za povernennia na Bat'kivshchynu."

————. 1993. "Novi piesy V. Vynnychenka ("Nad", "Velykyi sekret", "Kol-Nidre")" [New plays by V. Vynnychenko ("Nad," "Velykyi sekret," "Kol-Nidre"]. *Ukrains'ke literaturoznavstvo* 57: 118-33. First printed in *Krytyka* (1993, no. 4).

Smyrniw, Walter. 1984-1985. "Predictions and Prognoses in Vynnychenko's *Soniachna mashyna*." In *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US. Studies in Ukrainian Literature*. Ed. Bohdan Rubchak. Vol. XVI, 41-42: 327-340.

————. 1996. "The First Utopia in Ukrainian Belles Lettres: Pavlo Krat's *Koly ziishlo sontse*." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 3-4: 405-418.

Soroka, Mykola. 2000. "Chy ie panatseia vid mifu pro Anteia v ukrains'kii literaturi diaspory?" [The Myth of Antaeus and Ukrainian Literature in Diaspora: How Applicable?"] *Slovo i chas* 12: 11-18.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravotry. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, pp. 271-313. Urbana: U of Illinois P.

Sriblians'kyi, Mykola (real name: Mykyta Shapoval). 1912. "V. Vynnychenko. Na vesakh zhizni. Roman. Sbornik 'Zemlia'. Vol. IX. Moscow, 1912" [V. Vynnychenko. Equilibrium. A Novel]. *Ukrains'ka khata* 5: 303-304.

————. 1914. "Etiud pro futuryzm" [Etud about Futurism]. *Ukrains'ka khata* 6: 449-65.

Stein, Gertrude. 1971. *Paris France. Personal Recollections*. London: Peter Owen.

Stel'mashenko, Vadym. 1989. *Volodymyr Vynnychenko. Anotovana bibliohrafiia* [Volodymyr Vynnychenko. Annotated Bibliography]. Edmonton: CIUS.

Straczynski, J. Michael. 1982. *The Complete Book of Scriptwriting*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Writer's Digest Books.

Struk, Danylo Husar. 1984-1985. "Vynnychenko's Moral Laboratory." In *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US. Studies in Ukrainian Literature*. Ed. Bohdan Rubchak. Vol. XVI, 41-42: 275-288.

Struve, Gleb. 1984. *Russkaia literatura v izgnanii* [Russian Literature in Exile]. Paris: YMCA-Press. 2nd edition.

Syvachenko, Halyna. 1994. "'Soniachna mashyna' V.Vynnychenka i roman-antyutopiia XX storichchia" ['Solar Machine' by V. Vynnychenko and Anti-Utopian Novel in the 20th Century]. *Slovo i chas* 1: 42-47.

————. 1998. "*Soniachna mashyna* V. Vynnychenka v mahichnomu koli ekspresionizmu" [V. Vynnychenko's *The Solar Machine* in a Magical Circle of Expressionism]. *Slovo i chas* 1 (1998): 65-71.

————. 2003. *Prorok ne svoieii Vitchyzny. Ekspatriants'kyi 'metaroman' Volodymyra Vynnychenka: tekst i kontekst* [The Prophet of not His Homeland. Vynnychenko's Expatriate 'Metanovel:' Text and Context]. Kyiv: Al'ternatyvy.

Tabori, Paul. 1972. *The Anatomy of Exile. A Semantic and Historical Study*. London: Harrap.

Taniuk, Les. 1992. "Do problemy ukrainskoii 'prorochoii piesy. (*Kassandra* Lesi Ukrainky, *Prorok* V. Vynnychenka, *Narodnyi Malakhii* M. Kulisha)" [Toward Ukrainian 'Prophetic' Drama. (*Kassandra* by Lesia Ukrainka, *Prorok* by V. Vynnychenko and *Narodnyi Malakhii* by M. Kulish)]. *Suchasnist'* 2: 130-140.

Tarnavs'ka, Marta. 1981. "*Chorna Pantera* i chorna pliama na sovisti" [Black Panther and a Black Stain on the Conscience]. *Svoboda* [New Jersey] 74 (18 April): 2, 4.

The Oxford Encyclopedic English Dictionary. 1996. Eds. Judy Pearsall and Bill Trumble. New York: Oxford UP.

Todorov, Tzvetan. 1996. "The Journey and Its Narratives." In *Transports: Travel, Pleasure, and Imaginative Geography, 1600-1830*. Eds. Chloe Chard and Helen Langdon, pp. 287-96. New Haven and London: Yale UP.

Tölölyan, Khachig. 1994. "A Note from the Editor." *Diaspora* 3: 241.

Trubetzkoy, Nikolai. 1991. "The Ukrainian Problem". In his *The Legacy of Genghis Khan and Other Essays on Russia's Identity*, pp. 245-67. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Tucker, Martin. 1991. "Introduction." In *Literary Exile in the Twentieth Century. An Analysis and Biographical Dictionary*. Ed. Martin Tucker. New York. Westport (Connecticut), London: Greenwood Press.

Ukrainka, Lesia. 1954. "Vynnychenko." In her *Tvory*. Vol. 12, pp. 233-63. New York: Vydavnycha spilka Tyshchenko i Bilous.

————. 1965. "Zametki o noveiishei pol'skoi literature" [Notes on New Polish Literature]. In her *Tvory v desiaty tomakh*. Vol. 8, pp. 103-133. Kyiv: Dnipro.

————. 1975. *Zibrannia tvoriv u dvanadtsiaty tomakh* [Collected Works in Twelve Volumes]. Vol. 10. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.

Vaksberg, Arkadii. 1999. *Gibel' burevestnika* [The Death of a Stormy Petrel]. Moscow: Terra-Sport.

Vanchyts'ka, Irena. 1981. "Shche pro *Chornu Panteru*" [Again about Black Panther]. *Svoboda* [New Jersey] 95 (21 May): 2, 3.

Volin, Boris. 1925. "Prodelki Vinnichenka" [Vynnychenko's Dirty Tricks]. *Izvestiia* (6 October).

"Volodymyr Vynnychenko: povernennia" [Volodymyr Vynnychenko: Return] (Round-table discussion). 1989. *Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo* 7: 69-74.

Voronyi, Mykola. 1989. "Drama zhyvykh symvoliv" [Drama of Living Symbols] In his *Tvory*, pp. 405-412. Kyiv: Dnipro.

Vynnychenko, Rosalia. 1920. "Kapitalism i khvoroby" [Capitalism and Diseases]. *Nova doba* 14 (5 June): 4-5.

————. 1953. "Volodymyr Vynnychenko. Biohrafichna kanva" [Volodymyr Vynnychenko. Biographical Overview]. In *Volodymyr Vynnychenko. Statti i materiialy*, pp. 9-15. New York.

Vynnychenko, Volodymyr. Lysty do Chykalenka, 1907-14 [Letters to Chykalenko, 1907-14]. The Institute of Manuscripts at the Vernadsky Central Scientific Library [Kyiv], Fund 293 [Manusrcipt].

————. 1909. "Lyst do Gor'kogo" [Letter to Gorky]. *Rada* 119 (10 June): 4.

———. 1913. "Otkrytoie pis'mo k russkim pisateliam" [Open letter to Russian Writers]. *Ukrainskaia zhizn'* 10: 29-33.

———. 1914. "Lyst do redaktsii" [Letter to the Editor]. *Rada* no. 97 (12 May): 4.

———. 1914. "Lyst do redaktsii" [Letter to the Editor] *Rada* no. 144: 2-3; 145: 2-3.

———. 1919. *Chesnist' z soboiu* [Honesty with Oneself]. In his *Tvory*. Vol. 10. Kyiv-Vienna: Dzvin.

———. 1919. "Chudnyi epizod" [A Curious Incident]. In his *Tvory*. Vol. 4, pp. 139-51. Kyiv-Vienna: Dzvin.

———. 1919. "Istoriia Iakymovoho budynku" [Story about Iakym's House]. In his *Tvory*. Vol. 5, pp. 5-75. Kyiv-Vienna: Dzvin.

———. 1919. *Khochu* [I Want]. In his *Tvory*. Vol. 11. Kyiv-Vienna: Dzvin.

———. 1919. *Po-svii* [For one's own]. In his *Tvory*. Vol. 7. Kyiv-Vienna: Dzvin.

———. 1919. *Rivnovaha* [Equilibrium]. In his *Tvory*. Vol. 6. Kyiv-Vienna: Dzvin.

———. 1919. "Taiemna pryhoda" [A Mysterious Advanture]. In his *Tvory* Vol. 4, pp. 121-38. Kyiv-Vienna: Dzvin.

———. 1919. "Taina" [A Mystery]. In his *Tvory* Vol. 4, pp. 152-79. Kyiv-Vienna: Dzvin.

———. 1920. "Baraniache chornosotenstvo" [Sheepish Black Hundreds]. *Nova doba* 4: 4-5.

———. 1920. *Hrikh* [Sin]. Prague: Nova Ukraina.

———. 1920. "Maniiak bukhhalter" [Maniac-Accountant]. *Nova doba* 4 (27 March): 5.

———. 1920. "Myru!" [Let peace be!] *Nova doba* 8: 2-3.

———. 1920. "Shcho take teper ukrains'ka sotsiial-demokratiia?" [What is Ukrainian Social-Democracy Now?] *Nova doba* 1: 3-4.

———. 1920. "Utopiia i diisnist'" [Utopia and Reality]. *Nova doba* 2: 1.

———. 1920. *Vidrodzennia natsii* [Revival of the Nation]. 3 Vols. Kyiv-Vienna: Dzvin.

———. 1920. "Vsesvitnia revoliutsiia" [World Revolution]. *Nova doba* 7: 4-6.

———. 1923. "Znamenna podia" [A Remarkable Event]. *Nova Ukraina* (June), pp. 8-27.

———. 1926. *Povorot na Ukrainu* [The Return to Ukraine]. Prsibram: Vilna Hromada.

———. 1926-51. *Shchodennyk* [Diary]. The Vynnychenko Archive at Columbia University, New York [Manuscript].

———. 1928. *Bozhky* [Small Gods]. In his *Tvory*. Vol. 19. Kharkiv: Rukh.

———. 1928. Velykyi sekret [Big Secret]. Kharkiv: Rukh.

———. 1928. *Zapovit bat'kiv* [Testament of Forebears]. Kharkiv: Rukh.

———. 1929. *Memento* [Memento]. In his *Tvory*. Vol. 10. Kharkiv: Rukh.

———. 1929. *Nad* [Nad]. Kharkiv: Rukh.

———. 1930. *Dyzharmoniia* [Disharmony]. In his *Dramatychni tvory*. Vol. 9. Kharkiv: Rukh.

———. 1930. *Pisnia Izrailia* [Song of Israel]. Kharkiv: Rukh.

———. 1930. *Shchastia* [Happiness]. The Vynnychenko Aarchive at Columbia University, New York [Manuscript]. [Manuscript].

———. 1934. *Za iaku Ukrainu?* [For Which Ukraine?]. Paris.

———. 1936. *Vichnyi imperatyv* [Eternal Imperative]. [Manuscript].

———. 1938. *Pered novym etapom* [Before a New Stage]. Toronto: Vpered.

———. 1950. *Nova zapovid'* [New Commandment]. Vydavnytstvo Ukraina.

———. 1960. "Stelysia, barvinku, nyzen'ko" [Spread Low, Periwinkle]. In his *Prorok ta nevydani opovidannia*, pp. 93-105, New York: UVAN.

———. 1960. *Prorok* [Prorok]. In his *Prorok ta nevydani opovidannia*, pp. 7-77. New York: UVAN.

———. 1971. *Slovo za toboiu, Staline!* [Take the Floor, Stalin!] New York: The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US, Inc. and Commission for the Study and Preservation of the Literary Heritage of V. Vynnychenko.

————. 1972. *Na toi bik* [To the Other Side]. New York: The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the US., Inc. and Commission for the Study and Preservation of the Literary Heritage of V. Vynnychenko. 2ed edition.

————. 1980. *Shchodennyk* [Diary]. Vol. 1. Edmonton-New-York: Vydavnytstvo KIUS.

————. 1983. *Shchodennyk* [Diary]. Vol. 2. Edmonton-New-York: Vydavnytstvo KIUS.

————. 1988. *Poklady zolota* [Deposits of Gold]. New York: UVAN.

————. 1989. "Babusyn podarunok" [A Granny's present]. In his *Namysto*, pp. 333-75. Kyiv: Veselka.

————. 1989. "Fed'ko-khalamydnyk" [Fed'ko the Troublemaker]. In his *Namysto*, pp. 303-32. Kyiv: Dnipro.

————. 1989. Holota [Beggars]. In his *Krasa i syla. Povisti ta opovidannia*, pp. 247-351. Kyiv: Dnipro.

————. 1989. "Krasa i syla" [Beauty and Strength]. In his *Krasa i syla. Povisti ta opovidannia*, pp. 21-66. Kyiv: Dnipro.

————. 1989. "Kumediia z Kostem" [A Funny episode with Kost']. In his *Krasa i syla. Povisti ta opovidannia*, pp. 504-14. Kyiv: Dnipro.

————. 1989. "Moment" [A Moment]. In his *Krasa i syla. Povisti ta opovidannia*, pp. 488-503. Kyiv: Dnipro.

————. 1989. "Olaf Stefenzon" [Olaf Stefenzon]. In his *Krasa i syla. Povisti ta opovidannia*, pp. 613-63. Kyiv: Dnipro.

————. 1989. "Promin' sontsia" [A Ray of the Sun]. In his *Krasa i syla. Povisti ta opovidannia*, pp. 531-39. Kyiv: Dnipro.

————. 1989. *Soniachna mashyna* [Solar Machine]. Kyiv: Dnipro.

————. 1989. "Zina" [Zina]. In his *Krasa i syla. Povisti ta opovidannia*, pp. 474-487. Kyiv: Dnipro.

————. 1991. *Bazar* [Bazaar]. In his *Vybrani piesy*, pp. 85-142. Kyiv: Mystetstvo.

————. 1991. *Chorna Pantera i Bilyi Vedmid'* [Black Panther and Polar Bear]. In his *Vybrani piesy*, pp. 271-330. Kyiv: Mystetstvo.

———. 1991. *Selected Short Stories*. Wakefield, New Hampshire: Longwood Academic. Trans. by Theodore S. Prokopov.

———. 1991. *Zakon* [Law]. In his *Vybrani piesy*, pp. 535-96. Kyiv: Mystetstvo.

———. 1993. "Pro moral' panuiuchykh i moral' pryhnoblenykh" [About Morality of Exploiters and Exploited]. In *Istoriia filosofii Ukrainy*, pp. 421-26. Kyiv: Lybid'. Originally, this article was published in *Nash holos* [L'viv] (1911) 9-10: 451-79; 11-12: 529-64.

———. 1993. "Sposterezhennia neprofesionala. Marksyzm i mystetstvo" [Observations of a Not-Specialist. Marxism and Art]. In *Istoriia filosofii Ukrainy*, pp. 426-29. Kyiv: Lybid'. Originally, this article was published in *Dzvin* (1913) no. 12.

Washington, Bryan R. 1995. *The Politics of Exile. Ideology in Henry James, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and James Baldwin*. Boston: Northeastern UP.

Wells, H. G. 1967. *A Modern Utopia*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P.

White, Paul. 1995. "Geography, Literature and Migration." In *Writing Across Worlds. Literature and Migration*. Eds. Russell King, John Connell and Paul White, pp. 1-19. London and New York: Routledge.

Whitford, Frank. 1997. *The Berlin of George Grosz. Frawings, Watrecolours and Prints, 1912-1930*. Royal Academy of Arts, London, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Williams, Robert C. 1972. *Culture in Exile. Russian Émigrés in Germany, 1881-1941*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP.

Winnitschenko, W. 1949. *Nouveau Commendement*. Paris: Editions des Presses u Temps Present.

Wyman, Mark. 1989. *DP: Europe's Displaced Persons, 1945-1951*. Philadelphia: Balch Institute Press; London: Associated University Presses.

Wynnytschenko, Wolodymyr. 1910. *Sina* [Zina]. *Ukrainische Rundschau* 9-10: 246-251; 11-12: 278-284. [Vienna].

———. 1922. *Die Lüge*. Drama in drei Akten. Einzig autorisierte Übersetzung aus dem Ukrainischen von Gustav Specht. Potsdam: Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag.

———. 1922. *Der weisse Bär und die schwarze Pantherkatze*. Schauspiel in 4 Akten von Wolodymyr Wynnytschenko. Einzig autorisierte Übersetzung aus dem Ukrainischen von Gustav Specht. Potsdam: Gustav Kiepenheuer Verlag.

Zales'ka-Onyshkevych, Larysa. 1973. "Prorok—ostannia drama Volodymyra Vynnychenka" [Prophet—the Last Play by Volodymyr Vynnychenko]. *Slovo*. Zbirnyk 5, pp. 194-204. Edmonton.

"Zamyatin in Newcastle." http://pages.britishlibrary.net/alan.myers. [30 June 2005].

Zamyatin, Ievgenii. 1993. *We*. New York: Penguin Books.

Zerov, Mykola. 1992. "*Soniachna mashyna* iak literaturnyi tvir" [*Solar Machine* as a Literary Work]. In his *Tvory u dvokh tomakh* Vol. 2, pp. 435-56. Kyiv: Dnipro.

Zhulyns'kyi, Mykola. 1992. "'Iake velyke shchastia ia mala…' Radoshchi i pechali Rozalii Vynnychenko" ['What great happiness I had...' Joys and Sorrows of Rosalia Vynnychenko]. *Ukraina* 10: 14-17.

————. 1993. "Volodymyr Vynnychenko" [Volodymyr Vynnychenko]. In *Istoriia ukraiins'koii literatury. XX stolittia*. Ed. V. H. Donchyk. Book. 1, pp. 481-502. Kyiv: Lybid'.

APPENDIX

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF VYNNYCHENKO'S WORKS[1]

1902
Сила і краса (оповідання) / Power and Beauty (short story)
Біля машини (оповідання) / Near the Machine (short story)

1903
Антрепреньор Гаркун-Задунайський (оповідання) / Entrepreneur Harkun-Zadunais'kyi (short story)
Боротьба (оповідання) / Struggle (short story)
Народний діяч (оповідання) / The People's Activist (short story)
Роботи! (оповідання) / We Want Work! (short story)
"Салдатики!" (оповідання) / "Soldiers!" (short story)
Суд (оповідання) / The Trial (short story)

1904
Заручини (оповідання) / Engagement (short story)
Контрасти (нарис) / Contrasts (sketch)

1905
Голота (повість) / The Needy (story)
"Мнімий господін" (малюнок) [інша назва—Фельдфебельщина] / "Imaginary Man" (vignette) [Alternative Title: "Sergeant"]

1906
Моє останнє слово (оповідання) [інша назва—Дрібниця] / My Last Word (short story) [Alternative Title: "A Trivial Thing"]
На пристані (ескіз) / At the Pier (sketch)
Раб краси (оповідання) / A Slave of Beauty (short story)
Темна сила (оповідання) / Dark Force (short story)
Хто ворог? (нарис) / Who is the Enemy? (sketch)
Честь (оповідання) / Honour (short story)
Дисгармонія (п'єса) / Disharmony (play)
Ніч в тюрмі (поезія) / A Night in a Prison (poem)

1907
Дим (різдвяна казка) / Smoke (Christmas fairy-tale)
Момент (оповідання) / A Moment (short story)
Рабині справжнього (оповідання) / Slaves of the Genuine (short story)
Студент (оповідання) / The Student (short story)
"Умірковний" та "щирий" (оповідання) / "Restrained" and "Temperate" (short story)

---

[1] The list excludes Vynnychenko's numerous articles published in journals.

Малорос-европеєць (оповідання) / Maloros[2]-the European (short story)
Голод (оповідання) / Hunger (short story)
Ланцюг (оповідання) / The Chain (short story)
Великий Молох (п'єса) / Big Moloch (play)
Щаблі життя (п'єса) / Ladders of Life (play)

1908
Глум (оповідання) / Scorn (short story)
Голота (п'єса) / The Needy (play)

1909
Записна книжка (оповідання) / The Note Book (short story)
Зіна (оповідання) / Zina (short story)
Кумедія з Костем (оповідання) / A Funny Episode with Kost' (short story)
Купля (оповідання) / The Purchase (short story)
Щось більше за нас (оповідання) / Something Greater than Us (short story)
Memento (п'єса) / Memento (play)
Чужі люди (п'єса) / Strangers (play)

1910
Таємна пригода (оповідання) / A Mysterious Adventure (short story)
Тайна (виривки з щоденника) / A Mystery (short story)
Чудний епізод (оповідання) / A Curious Incident (short story)
Базар (п'єса) / Bazaar (play)
Брехня (п'єса) / The Lie (play)

1911
Виривок з "Споминів" / An Excerpt from "Recollections"
Кузь та Грицунь (оповідання) / Kooz' and Hrytsoon' (short story)
Співочі товариства (п'єса) / Circles of Singers (play)
Честность с собой (роман) [російською мовою] / Honesty with Oneself (novel) [in Russian][3]
Чорна Пантера і Білий Ведмідь (п'єса) / Black Panther and Polar Bear (play)

1912
На весах жизни (роман) [російською мовою] / Equilibrium (novel) [in Russian][4]
Історія Якимового будинку (оповідання) / A Story about Iakym's House (story)
Маленька рисочка (оповідання) / A Small Characteristic (short story)
Промінь сонця (оповідання) / A Ray of the Sun (short story)
Таємність (оповідання) / Secrecy (short story)
Федько-халамидник (оповідання) / Fed'ko the Troublemaker (short story)
Чекання (оповідання) / Waiting (short story)

---

[2] A term used to denote Ukrainians loyal to the Russian Empire.
[3] The Ukrainian version appeared in 1919.
[4] The Ukrainian version appeared in 1913 (*Рівновага (роман з життя емігрантів): Твори*. Кн. 6. Переклад з російської Н.Романович. Київ: Дзвін).

Дочка жандарма (п'єса) / The Gendarme's Daughter (play)
Натусь (п'єса) / Natus' (play)

1913
Олаф Стефензон (оповідання) / Olaf Stefenzon (story)
Переможець (оповідання) / The Winner (short story)
По-свій (роман) / For One's Own (novel)
Талісман (оповідання) / Talisman (short story)
Терень (оповідання) / Teren' (short story)
Молода кров (п'єса) / Young Blood (play)

1914
Божки (роман) / Small Gods (novel)
Заветы отцов (роман) [російською мовою] / Testament of Forefathers (novel) [published in Russian][5]
Радість (оповідання) / Joy (short story)
Мохноноге (п'єса) / Hairy Monster (play) [staged in Russian][6]

1915
Босяк (оповідання) / The Tramp (short story)

1916
Баришенька (оповідання) / The Sweet Lady (short story)
Хочу (роман) / I Want (novel)
Хома Прядка (оповідання) / Khoma Priadka (short story)
Пригвождені (п'єса) / The Nailed Down (play)

1917
Записки Кирпатого Мефістофеля (роман) / Notes of the Snub-Nosed Mephistopheles (novel)
Сліпий (оповідання) / The Blind (short story)

1918
Панна Мара (п'єса) / Miss Mara (play)

1919
Між двох сил (п'єса) / Between Two Powers (play)

1920
Гріх (п'єса) / The Sin (play)

1921
Злочинство (оповідання) [неопубліковане] / The Crime (short story) [unpublished]

---

[5] The Ukrainian version appeared in 1928 (*Заповіт батьків (роман): Твори*. Т. 22. Харків: Рух).
[6] The play was considered lost until it was published in the journal *Vezha*: 4-5 (1996): 3-30 and 6-7 (1997): 23-66.

1922
Закон (п'єса) [російською мовою] / The Law (play) [in Russian][7]

1923
Бабусин подарунок (оповідання) / A Present from Granny (short story)
На той бік (повість) / To the Other Side (novel)

1925
Ательє щастя (п'єса) [не закінчена] / The Atelier of Happiness (play) [not finished]

1926
На лоні природи (оповідання) / In the Great Wide Open (short story)
У графському маєтку (оповідання) / In the Earl's Estate (short story)
Поворот на Україну (памфлет) / The Return to Ukraine (pamphlet)

1927
Поклади золота [уривки з романа] / Deposits of Gold [excerpts from the novel][8]

1928
Соняшна машина (роман) [написаний у 1921-24] / The Solar Machine (novel) [written in 1921-24]
Великий секрет (п'єса) [написана в 1925] / Big Secret (play) [written in 1925]
Хвостаті (оповідання) / With Tails (short story)

1929
Над (п'єса) [написана в 1928] / Nad (play) [written in 1928]

1930
Пісня Ізраїля (п'єса) [написане в 1921-22] / A Song of Israel (play) [written in 1921-22]
Віють вітри, віють буйні (оповідання) [написане в 1921-22] / The Winds Blow, the Wild Winds (short story) [written in 1922]
Гей, не спиться (оповідання) [написане в 1928] / Hey, I Can't Sleep (short story) [written in 1928]
Гей, ти бочечко (оповідання) [написане в 1928] / Hey You, Barrel (short story) [written in 1928]
За Сибіром сонце сходить (оповідання) [написане в 1929] / The Sun Rises Beyond Siberia (short story) [written in 1929]
Ой, випила, вихилила (оповідання) [написане в 1929] / Hey, I Drank to the Bottom (short story) [written in 1929]
Та немає гірш нікому (оповідання) [написане в 1929] / And It Couldn't Be Worth (short story) [written in 1929]

---

[7] The Ukrainian version appeared in 1923 (*Закон*. П'єса на 4 дії. Прага: Нова Україна).
[8] The full version was published in 1988 (New York).

Гей, хто в лісі, обізвися (оповідання) [написане в 1929] / Hey, in the Forest, Can You Hear Me (short story) [written in 1929]
Гей , чи пан, чи пропав (оповідання) [написане в 1929] / Hey, All Or Nothing (short story) [written in 1929]
Щастя (філософський трактат) [неопублікований] / Happiness (philosophical treatise) [unpublished][9]

1934
За яку Україну? (памфлет) / For which Ukraine? (pamphlet)

1936
Вічний імператив (роман) [неопублікований] / Eternal Imperative (novel) [unpublished]

1938
Перед новим етапом (памфлет) / Before a New Stage [pamphlet]

1948
Конкордизм (філософський трактат) [неопублікований] / Concordism (philosophical treatise) [unpublished]

1949
Nouveau Commendement (novel) [французькою мовою] / New Commandment (novel) [in French][10]

1960
Пророк (п'єса) [написана в 1929] / The Prophet (play) [written in 1929]
Стелися барвінку, низенько (оповідання) [написане в 1922] / Creep, Periwinkle, Low, Low (short story) [written in 1922]

1971
Слово за тобою, Сталіне! (роман) [написаний у 1950] / Take the Floor Stalin! (novel) [written in 1950]

1999
Лепрозорій (роман) [написаний у 1938] / Leprosarium (novel) [written in 1938][11]

---

[9] This work will be revised in the other philosophical treatise, K*onkordyzm* (1948).

[10] Winnitschenko, W. *Nouveau Commendement*. Paris: Editions des Presses au Temps Present. The Ukrainian version appeared in 1950 (*Нова заповідь*. Видавництво "Україна"). This is a revised version of the novel written in 1932.

[11] It was recently claimed that two other Vynnychenko plays have been discovered: 1) *Rizhnymy shliakhamy* [On Different Paths] written during 14 January—23 March 1903 in L'viv; and 2) *Dorohu krasi* [Go, Beauty] (14-23 January 1910, Paris) (Kovalyk, 79-81).